

THE *Im Morgan*  
CORRUPTIONS  
OF THE  
Church of *Rome*,  
In relation to  
*Ecclesiastical Government*,

THE  
RULE of FAITH, and FORM  
of DIVINE WORSHIP.

IN ANSWER  
To the Bishop of Meaux's  
QUERIES.

---

BY  
The Right Reverend Dr. BULL,  
Lord Bishop of St. Davids.

---

The Second Edition.

---

London:  
Printed by W. B. for RICHARD SARE at  
Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn. 1707.

---

---



---

A LETTER from the Bishop of Meaux  
to Robert Nelson, Esq; upon his  
having read Dr. Bull's Book, [en-  
tituled *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catho-  
licæ Trium Primorum Seculorum*  
de necessitate credendi, quod Do-  
minus noster Jesus Christus, sit  
verus Deus. ] presented to him by  
that worthy Gentleman.

---

To Mr. Nelson at Blackheath.



St. Germaine en Laye, 24 July, 1700.

I Received, Sir, about a fortnight ago  
the honour of your Letter from Black-  
heath near London, dated the 18th of  
July of the last Year, when at the same  
time you sent me Dr. Bull's Book enti-  
tuled, *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholiceæ*, &c.  
I must first, Sir, acquaint you, that the  
sight of your Hand and Name gave me  
great deal of Joy, and that I was ex-  
tremely pleased with this testimony of

your remembrance. As to Dr. *Bull*'s performance, I was willing to read it all over, before I acknowledged the receipt of it, that I might be able to give you my sense of it. 'Tis admirable, and the matter he treats could not be explained with greater Learning and greater Judgment. This is what I desire you would be pleased to acquaint him with, and at the same time with the unfeigned Congratulations of all the Clergy of *France*, assembled in this place, for the Service he does the Catholick Church in so well defending her determination of the necessity of believing the Divinity of the Son of God. Give me leave to acquaint him, there is one thing I wonder at, which is, that so great a Man, who speaks so advantageously of the Church, of Salvation which is obtain'd only in Unity with her, and of the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of *Nice*; which infers the same assistance for all others assembled in the same Church, can continue a moment without acknowledging her. Or either, Sir, let him vouchsafe to tell me who am a zealous defender of the Doctrine he teaches, what it is he means by the term *Catholick Church*? Is it the Church of *Rome*, and those

those that adhere to her? Is it the Church of *England*? Is it a confused heap of Societies separated the one from the other? And how can they be that Kingdom of Christ not divided against it self, and which never shall perish? It would be a great satisfaction to me to receive some answer upon this Subject, that might explain the Opinion of so weighty and solid an Author. I very much rejoice at the good News you send me of your Lady's welfare, whom I heartily pray for, with you and your Family. You have been rightly inform'd in the account you have received of the admirable Qualifications of the *Arch Bishop* of *Paris*, now *Cardinal de Noailles*, the See of *St. Denis* has not for a long time been so worthily filled. If Mr. *Collier* whom you mention has written any thing in *Latin* concerning the *modern mystical Divinity*, you will oblige me in conveying it to me. But above all remember, that I am with a great deal of sincerity,

S I R,

*Your most humble, and  
most obedient Servant,*

† *J. Benigne Bishop of Meaux.*

Dr.

---

---

## Dr. B V L L's Answer.

Sect. I. **T**H E approbation of my Writings by so learned and illustrious a Prelate as Monsieur *de Meaux*, especially when join'd with the Congratulations of the learned *Clergy of France* in general, is so high an Honour done me, that if I did not set a great value on it, I were altogether unworthy of it.

But as to the Wonder of Monsieur *de Meaux*, I cannot but very much wonder at it, especially at the Reasons on which it is grounded. He wonders *how I that speak so advantageously of the Church, &c. can continue a moment without acknowledging her.* Her! What her doth the Bishop mean? Doubtless the present *Church of Rome*, in the Communion whereof he himself lives, and to which his design seems to be to invite me. But where do I speak so advantagiously of the present *Church of Rome*? No where, I am sure. My thoughts concerning her,

I have plainly (perhaps too plainly and bluntly in the Opinion of Monsieur *de Meaux*,) deliver'd in the Book which he so commends, *Jud. Eccl. Cathol. cap. 5. §. 3.* where having spoken of that singular Purity of the Faith, which was in the *Church of Rome* in the first Ages; and taken notice of, and extolled by some of the Primitive Fathers, I thus conclude, " Oh that so great a Happiness, such " Purity of Faith had always continued " in that Church! But, alas! we may " now cry out in the holy Prophet's " words, *How is the faithful City become " an Harlot?* *Isai. 1. 21.*

But Monsieur *de Meaux* seems to think the Roman and the Catholick Church to be convertible Terms, which is strange in so learned a Man, especially at this time of the day. Cannot the Catholick Church be mention'd, but presently the Roman Church must be understood? The Book which the Bishop refers to, bears this Title, *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicæ trium primorum seculorum, &c.* Of the Catholick Church of the three first Centuries, I do indeed speak with great deference. To her Judgment (next to the Holy Scriptures,) I appeal against the oppugners of our

Lord's Divinity at this day, whether *Arians* or *Socinians*. The Rule of Faith, the Symbols or Creeds, the Profession whereof was in those Ages the condition of Communion with the Catholick Church, (mention'd by *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and others,) I heartily and firmly believe. This *Primitive Catholick Church*, as to her Government and Discipline, her Doctrines of Faith, and her Worship of God, I think ought to be the Standard, by which we are to judge of the Orthodoxy and Purity of all other succeeding Churches, according to that

*Vide Apost. 34.* excellent Rule of *Tertullian*.  
*& Conc. Ephes. de Prescript. adv. Hæres.*  
*Can. 8.* cap. xx,xxi. "Every Déscent

" must neccssarily deduce it self from its  
" first Original. If these things are true,  
" it is plain that every Doctrine which  
" these Apostolical, these Original and  
" Mother-Churches held as analogous  
" to the Rule of Faith, is to be owned  
" as true, and as containing without  
" doubt what the Churches received  
" from the Apostles, the Apostles from  
" Christ, Christ from God ; but that all  
" other Doctrine is to be looked upon  
" as false, and no ways favouring of  
" those Truths which have been deli-  
" vered.

“ vered by the Churches, and the Apo-  
“ stles, and Christ, and God. And to  
“ the same purpose he discourses,  
“ cap. 31. *ejusdem Libri.*

According to this Rule, the *Church of England* will be found the best and purest Church this Day in the Christian World. Upon which account, I bless God that I was born, baptized and bred up in her *Communion*; wherein I firmly resolve by his Grace to persist, as long as I live. How far the present *Church of Rome* hath departed from this Primitive Pattern, will appear hereafter.

Monsieur *de Meaux* adds as a farther Reason of his Wonder, *that I speak of Salvation as only to be found in unity with her.* Her! Doth the Bishop here again mean the present *Church of Rome*? If he doth, I must plainly tell him, that I am so far from ever thinking, that *Salvation* is only to be found in *unity* with her, that on the contrary I verily believe they are in great danger of their *Salvation*, who live in her *Communion*; that is, who own her erroneous *Doctrines*, and join in her corrupt *Worship*, of which I shall give a large account before I have done. I do indeed in the Book,

which the Bishop hath an Eye unto, shew, that there was a Canon or Rule of Faith received in the Primitive Church, which whoever in any point thereof denied or opposed, was judged an Heretick, and if he persisted in his Heresie, cast out of the Communion of the Catholick Church, and so out of the ordinary way of Salvation. But what is this to the present *Church of Rome* and her Communion?

The Bishop's last Reason is, *that I own the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, which infers the same Assistance for all others assembled in the same Church.* To which I answer; I mention this indeed as the Opinion of *Socrates*, but at the same time, I give another account of the Credit that is to be given to the determination of the *Nicene* Council in the Article of our Saviour's Divinity, in the *Proemium* of my *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, §. 3. where my words are these: "But the same *Socrates*, Chap. ix. of the same Book, reproves *Sabinus* for not considering with himself, that they who came to this Council, how illiterate soever they were, yet being enlightened by God, and the Grace of the Holy Ghost could

“ could in no wise depart from the  
“ Truth. For he seems to have thought  
“ the enlightening Grace of the Holy  
“ Ghost always to accompany a General  
“ Council of Bishops, and to preserve  
“ them from Error, especially in any of  
“ the necessary Articles of Faith. Which  
“ Supposition, if any one shall refuse to  
“ admit of, *Socrates's Argumentation*  
“ may be thus directed and urged against  
“ him: The *Nicene Fathers*, let any  
“ imagine them as unskilful and illite-  
“ rate as he will, yet in the main, were  
“ doubtless pious Men: But it is incre-  
“ dible that so many holy and approved  
“ Men, assembled from all Parts of the  
“ Christian World, (who, how defe-  
“ tive soever in any other sort of Know-  
“ ledge, could by no means be ignorant  
“ of the first and fundamental Doctrine  
“ of the Holy Trinity, a Doctrine  
“ wherein the very *Catechumens* were  
“ not uninstructed, or of what themselves  
“ had received from their Predecessors  
“ concerning it,) should wickedly con-  
“ spire amongst themselves, to new mo-  
“ del the Faith received in the Church,  
“ concerning this principal Article of  
“ Christianity. And indeed, all these  
things considered and laid together, it  
was.

was morally impossible that the *Nicene* Fathers should have erred, in the Determination of the Article before them. And that they did not actually err, I have sufficiently proved in the Bishop's own Judgment, in the following Treatise.

But suppose I were fully of *Socrates*'s Opinion, concerning the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost attending every truly General Council in matters of Faith, I should be never the nearer to the Communion of the *Church of Rome*, as it is now subjected to the Decrees of the *Trent-Council*: For as I afterwards add in the same Preface, §. 8. “ The “ Assembly at *Trent* is to be called by “ any other Name, rather than that of “ a General Council.

I proceed to the Bishop's Questions: He asks me *what I mean by the Catholick Church*? I answer: What I mean by the *Catholick Church* in the Book, which he all along refers to, I have already shewn, and the very Title of the Book sufficiently declares. If he asks me *what I mean by the Catholick Church*, speaking of it as now it is? I answer; By the *Catholick Church*, I mean the *Church Universal*, being a *Collection* of all the *Churches*.

Churches throughout the World, who retain the Faith ( $\alpha\pi\alpha\xi$ ) once delivered to the Saints; *Jude 3.* that is, who hold and profess in the Substance of it, that Faith and Religion which was delivered by the Apostles of Christ to the first original Churches, according to *Tertullian's* Rule before-mention'd. Which Faith and Religion is contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, and the main Fundamentals of it compriz'd in the Canon or Rule of Faith, universally received throughout the Primitive Churches, and the Profession thereof acknowledged to be a sufficient *tessera* or *badge* of a Catholick Christian. All the Churches at this day which hold and profess this Faith, and Religion, however distant in place, or distinguish'd by different Rites and Ceremonies, yea, or divided in some extra-fundamental Points of Doctrine, yet agreeing in the Essentials of the Christian Religion, make up together one Christian Catholick Church under the Lord Christ, the supreme Head thereof. The Catholick Church under this Notion, is not a *confused heap of Societies separated one from another*. But it seems, no other Union of the Church will satisfie the Bishop,

shop, but an Union of all the Churches of Christ throughout the World, under one visible Head, having a Jurisdiction over them all, and that Head the *Bishop of Rome* for the time being. But such an Union as this was never dream'd of amongst Christians for at least the first Six hundred Years, as shall be shewn in its due place.

The Catholick Church, I believe, shall never totally fail, that is, Christianity shall never utterly perish from the Face of the Earth, but there shall be some to maintain and uphold it to the end of the World. Although some of the ancient Doctors of the Church have given us a very tragical Description of the state of the Universal Church of Christ, which shall be under the Reign of the great *Antichrist*. But I know of no Promise of Indefectibility from the Faith made to any particular Church, no, not to the *Church of Rome* it self. And if we may judge by the Holy Scriptures, and by the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Catholick Church, the present *Church of Rome* hath already lamentably fail'd, and fallen into many dangerous and gross Errors, as will by and by appear. Now that Church which hath already so far fail'd

fail'd, why may she not utterly fail? If she be found but in one Error, the infallible direction of her Judgment, upon which her Indefectibility from the Faith must depend, is gone and destroy'd. I add, that divers eminent \* Doctors, \* *Ribera & Viegain Apoc.* even of the Roman Commu-  
nion, have discover'd out of 17.

the *Apocalyps*, that *Rome* it self shall at length become the Seat of Antichrist. If so, where will the *Church of Rome* then be?

But I wonder why Monsieur *de Meaux* should ask me, whether by the Catholick Church, I mean the *Church of Rome* or the *Church of England*? He knows full well, I mean neither the one nor the other. For to say either of the *Church of Rome*, or of the *Church of England*, or of the *Greek Church*, or of any other particular *Church* of what denomination soever, that it is the Catholick or Universal Church, would be as absurd, as to affirm that a part is the whole. And to be sure I never meant the *Church of Rome* to be the Catholick Church exclusively to all other Churches. I am so far from any such meaning, that my constant Judgment of the *Church of Rome* hath been, that if she may be allowed still

## 16 *The Ecclesiastical Government*

still to remain a *Part*, or *Member* of the Catholick Church, (which hath been questioned by some learned Men, upon Grounds and Reasons not very easie to be answer'd,) yet she is certainly a very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her Primitive Purity. This I must insist upon, and have obliged my self to prove; and I prove it thus:

*Sect. II. The Church of Rome hath quite altered the Primitive Ecclesiastical Government, changed the Primitive Canon or Rule of Faith, and miserably corrupted the Primitive Liturgy or Form of Divine Worship.*

*1st*, She hath quite altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, by erecting a Monarchy in the Church, and setting up her Bishop, as the universal Pastor and Governour of the whole Catholick Church, and making all other Bishops to be but his Vicars and Substitutes, as to their Jurisdiction.

For that the Bishop of *Rome* had no such universal Jurisdiction in the Primitive Times, is most evident from the sixth *Canon* of the first *Nicene Council*, occasioned, as it appears, by the Schism of *Meletius*, an ambitious Bishop in *Egypt*,

Egypt, who took upon him to ordain Bishops there, without the consent of the Metropolitan Bishop of *Alexandria*. The Words of the Canon are these: *Let the ancient Customs prevail that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, That the Bishop of Alexandria have the Power over them all, for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like Custom. In like manner, in Antioch, and all other Provinces, let the Privileges be preserved to the Churches.*] From this Canon it is plain, that the three Metropolitan Bishops, or *Primates*, (they were not as yet, I think call'd *Patriarchs*) of *Alexandria, Rome and Antioch*, had their distinct Jurisdictions, each independant on the other; and that all other chief Bishops or *Primates* of Provinces, had the same Privileges which are here confirm'd to them. It is true, this Canon doth not particularly describe or determine what the Bounds are of the *Roman* Bishop's Power, as neither doth it the Limits of the Bishop of *Antioch*'s Jurisdiction, but only those of the Bishop of *Alexandria*'s Province. The Reason hereof is manifest, the case of the Bishop of *Alexandria* only was at this time laid before the Synod, whose Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction in *Egypt* had been lately invaded by the schismatical Ordinations of *Meletius*, as I before observ'd. But that the Roman Bishop's Power, as well as that of the other Metropolitans, had its Bounds, is most manifest from the Example that is drawn from thence, for the Limits of other Churches. For what an absurd thing is it, that the Church of *Rome* should be made the Pattern for assigning the Limits to other Metropolitan Churches, if that Church also had not her known Limits at the same time when this Canon was made! Intollerable is the Exposition which *Bellarmin*, and other Romanists give of these words of the Canon; *for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like Custom*; i.e. (they say,) "It was the Custom of " the Bishop of *Rome* to permit, or " leave to the Bishop of *Alexandria* the " Regimen of *Egypt*, *Libia* and *Pentapo-* " *lis*. Certainly, τῷτο τινθεὶ δὲ implies a like custom in the Church of *Alexandria*, and in the Church of *Rome*; and the sense of the Canon is most evident, that the Bishop of *Alexandria* should, according to the ancient custom of the Church, (not by the permission of the *Roman Bishop*,) enjoy the full Power

in

in his Province, as by the like ancient custom the Bishop of *Rome* had the Jurisdiction of his. But they that would see this Canon fully explain'd and clear'd from all the trifling Cavils and Exceptions of the *Romanists*, may consult the large and copious Annotations of the learned Dr. *Beveridge*, Bishop of *St. Asaph*, upon it, where they will receive ample satisfaction.

Thus was the Government of the Catholick Church in the Primitive Times distributed among the several chief Bishops or Primates of the Provinces, neither of them being accountable to the other, but all of them to an *Oecumenical* Council, which was then held to be the only supreme visible Judge of Controversies arising in the Church, and to have the power of finally deciding them. Hence the case of the Bishop of *Alexandria* before-mention'd, was not brought before the Bishop of *Rome*, or any other Metropolitan, but referr'd to the Fathers of the *Nicene Council* to be finally determined by them.

The universal Pastorship or Government of the Catholick Church, was never claim'd by any Bishop till towards the end of the sixth Century, and then it

20 The Ecclesiastical Government

it was thought to be challenged by *John Patriarch of Constantinople*, assuming to himself the Title of *Oecumenical or Universal Bishop*; whom *Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome*, vehemently opposed, pronouncing him the forerunner of Antichrist, who durst usurp so arrogant a Title. And 'tis worthy observing how passionately the same *Gregory* expresseth his detestation of the Pride and Arrogance of the *Patriarch of Constantinople*, in his Letter to *Mauritius the Emperor*:

<sup>4 Greg. lib. 4. Epist. 32.</sup> " \* I am forc'd to cry out, " O the Times ! O the

" Manners ! All things in  
" the Parts of *Europe* are delivered up to  
" the Power of barbarous People. Cities  
" are destroyed, Castles demolished,  
" Provinces depopulated, &c. and yet  
" the Bishops, who ought to have lain  
" prostrate on the ground cover'd with  
" Ashes and Weeping, even they covet  
" to themselves Names of Vanity, and  
" glory in new and prophane Titles.  
And yet this Name of Vanity, this new  
and prophane Title of Universal Bishop,  
was afterwards accepted by *Boniface III. Bishop of Rome*, when 'twas offer'd him  
by that bloody Miscreant *Phocas the Emperour*; and the same Title hath  
been

been own'd by the succeeding Bishops of the Roman Church, and that as due to them by Divine Right. Indeed, it may be question'd whether *John of Constantinople*, by assuming the Title of *Oecumenical Bishop*, meant that he had an universal Jurisdiction over all other Bishops and Churches : But this is certain, that *Gregory* opposed the Title under this Notion ; this appearing abundantly from his || Epistle to *John the Patriarch* ; and 'tis as certain *Epist. 38.* that under the same Notion the Bishops of *Rome* afterwards assump'd that Title, and do claim it to this day. Nay, the *Universal Pastorship* and Jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop over all Bishops and Churches, is now no longer a meer Court-Opinion, maintain'd only by the Pope's Parasites and Flatterers, but is become a part of the Faith of the Church of *Rome* ; it being one of the Articles of the *Trent-Creed*, to which all Ecclesiasticks are sworn themselves, and which, by the same Oath they are obliged to teach the Laity under their care and charge, as hereafter will appear. So that now there is no room for that Distinction, wherewith some have sooth'd and pleased themselves, between the Church and Court

Court of *Rome*; for the Court is enter'd into the Church of *Rome*, or rather the Court and Church of *Rome* are all one.

Se<sup>t</sup>. III. 2. The Church of *Rome* hath changed the *Primitive Canon*, or *Rule of Faith*, by adding new Articles to it, as necessary to be believ'd in order to Salvation: Look to the Confession of Faith, according to the *Council of Trent*. It begins indeed, with the *Primitive Rule of Faith* as is explain'd by the *Council of Nice* and *Constantinople*; and happy had it been for the Church of Christ if it had ended there. But there are added afterwards a many new Articles, and with reference to them, as well as to the Articles of the old Creed; it concludes thus: "This true Catholick Faith, "without which none can be saved, "which I now willingly profess and unfeignedly hold; the same I promise, "vow, and swear, by the help of God, "most constantly to keep and confess, "entire and inviolate, even to my last "Breath; and to endeavour moreover, "to the utmost of my power, that it "may be kept taught, and professed by "all my Subjects, or by those that are "any way under my care. So help me "God,

" God, and these his holy Gospels.

Now if you examine those Articles that follow after the *Constantinopolitan* Creed, you will find they are not meerly *explicatory* of any Article or Articles of the old Canon of Faith ; (such as that of ὁμοσ-  
ει@ or same Substance in the *Nicene* Confession, which was virtually contain'd in the ancient Canon, and by good conse-  
quence deducible from it, and was appa-  
rently also the sense of the Catholick Church  
before the *Nicene* Council ; ) but they  
are plain *Additions* to the Rule of Faith.  
Now if these Articles were true, yet they  
ought not presently to be made a part  
of our Creed ; for every Truth is not  
fundamental, nor every Error damnable.  
We deny not but that General or Provin-  
cial Councils may make Constitutions  
concerning extra-fundamental Verities,  
and oblige all such as are under their ju-  
risdiction to receive them, at least pas-  
sively, so as not openly and contuma-  
ciously to oppose them. But to make  
any of these a part of the Creed, and to  
oblige all Christians under pain of Dam-  
nation to receive and believe them, this  
is really to add to the Creed, and to  
change the ancient *Canon* or *Rule* of  
Faith. But alas ! these superadded Ar-  
ticles

ticles of the *Trent-Creed*, are so far from being certain Truths, that they are most of them manifest Untruths, yea, gross and dangerous Errors. To make this appear, I shall not refuse the pains of examining some of the chief of them.

The first Article I shall take notice of is this; “ I profess, that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead ; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, there is truly, and really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is wrought a Conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the Blood, which Conversion the Catholick Church calls *Transubstantiation*. Where this Proposition [*That in the Mass there is offer'd to God a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead,*] having that other of the *substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist* immediately annexed to it ; the meaning of it must necessarily be this, *That in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood*,

## Chang'd by the Church of Rome 25

Blood of Christ are again offer'd up to God as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of Men. Which is an impious Proposition, derogatory to the one full Satisfaction of Christ made by his Death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture, *Heb. 7. and 27. and 9. and 12, 15, 26, 28. and 10. 12, 14.* It is true, the *Eucharist* is frequently call'd by the antient Fathers *πεστοει*, *δυσια*, an *Oblation*, a *Sacrifice*. But it is to be remem-ber'd, that they say also it is *δυσια λοσικη* *και αναιματι*, a *reasonable Sacrifice*, a *Sacrifice without Blood* : Which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very Blood of Christ were offer'd up to God.

They held the *Eucharist* to be a *com-memorative Sacrifice*, and so do we. This is the constant Language of the ancient Liturgies, *We offer by way of commemoration* ; according to our Saviour's Words when he or-dain'd this holy Rite, *Do Just. Mart.  
this in commemoration of Dial. cum  
me. In the Eucharist then, Tryph. p. 296,  
Christ is offer'd not hypo-297.*

statically as the *Trent* Fathers have determin'd, (for so he was but once offer'd) but *commemoratively* only : And this Commemoration is made to God the Fa-

ther, and is not a bare rememb'ring, or putting our selves in mind of him. For every Sacrifice is directed to God, and the Oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath him for its Object, and not Man. In the holy *Eucharist* therefore, we set before God the Bread and Wine, as *Figures or Images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious Body*; (they are the very words of the *Clementine Liturgy*,) and plead to God the merit of his Son's Sacrifice once offer'd on the Cross for us Sinners; and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching him for the sake thereof, to bestow his heavenly Blessings on us.

To conclude this matter: The Ancients held the *Oblation* of the *Eucharist* to be answerable in some respects to the legal Sacrifices; that is, they believ'd that our Blessed Saviour ordain'd the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* as a Rite of Prayer and Praise to God, instead of the manifold and bloody Sacrifices of the Law. That the *legal Sacrifices* were Rites to invoke God by, is evident from many Texts of Scripture, see especially *1 Sam. 7. 9. and 13. 12. Ezra 6. 10. Prov. 15. 8.* And that they were also Rites for praising and blessing God for

for his Mercies, appears from 2. Chron. 29. 27. Instead therefore of slaying of Beasts, and burning of Incense, whereby they praised God, and call'd upon his Name under the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour appointed this Sacrament of Bread and Wine, as a Rite whereby to give Thanks and make supplication to his Father in his Name. This you may see fully clear'd and prov'd by the Learned Mr. Mede, in his Treatise intituled, *The Christian Sacrifice*. The *Eucharistical Sacrifice* thus explain'd, is indeed *λογικὴ θυσία, a reasonable Sacrifice*, widely different from that monstrous Sacrifice of the Mass, taught in the Church of Rome.

The other Branch of the Article is concerning *Transubstantiation*, wherein the Ecclesiastick professeth upon his solemn Oath his Belief, that in the Eucharist *there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood of Christ*. A Proposition that bids defiance to all the Reason and Sense of Mankind. Nor (God be praised) hath it any ground or foundation in Divine Revelation. Nay, the Text of Scripture on which the Church

28 *Transubstantiation contrary*

of *Rome* builds this Article, duly considered, utterly subverts and overthrows it: She grounds it upon the words of the Institution of the holy Sacrament by our Saviour, the same Night wherein he was betrayed; when he took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, *This is my Body*, τὸ ἄρτον, faith St. Luke, τὸ κλαύστρον, faith St. Paul, *which is given and broken for you*. After the same manner he took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament*, τὸ εὐχύστρον, *which is shed for many for the remission of Sins*. Now whatsoever our Saviour said, was undoubtedly true: But these Words could not be true in a proper sense; for our Saviour's Body was not then given, or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of his Blood yet shed. The words therefore must necessarily be understood in a figurative Sense; and then, what becomes of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*? The meaning of our Saviour is plainly this: What I now do, is a representation of my Death and Passion near approaching; and what I now do, do ye hereafter, do this in remembrance

membrance of me ; let this be a standing, perpetual Ordinance in my Church to the end of the World ; let my Death be thus annunciated and shewn forth till I come to Judgment. See *1 Cor. 11. 26.*

As little Foundation hath this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the ancient Church, as appears sufficiently from what hath been already said concerning the Notion then universally received of the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*. It was then believ'd to be an *andynas*, or Commemoration, by the Symbols of Bread and Wine, of the Body and Blood of Christ, once offer'd up to God on the Cross for our Redemption ; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God of the very Body and Blood of Christ, substantially present under the appearance of Bread and Wine ; for these two Notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. The ancient Doctors, yea, and Liturgies of the Church, affirm the Eucharist to be *in cruentum sacrificium, a sacrifice without Blood* ; which it cannot be said to be, if the very Blood of Christ were therein present and offer'd up to God. In the *Clementine Liturgy*, the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are said

30 *Transubstantiation contrary*

to be *Antitypa*, *correspondent Types*, *Figures and Images* of the precious Body and Blood of Christ. And diverse others of the Fathers speak in the same plain Language. *Vid. Greg. Naz. Apol. Orat. 1. Tom. 1. Cyril. Hierosol. 5. Cat. Myst. Ambros. de Sacrament. lib. 4. cap. 4.*

We are not ignorant, that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist*, by or upon the Consecration of them, do become, and are made the *Body and Blood of Christ*. But we know also, that tho' they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient Doctors of the Church, as *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenaeus*, seem to have had this Notion, that by, or upon the sacerdotal Benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a divine Virtue from Christ, descends upon the Elements, and accompanies them to all worthy Communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are the Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in Heaven, being virtually united

to

to the Elements of Bread and Wine on Earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies, in which it is pray'd, *that God would send down his Spirit upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.* And this doubtless, is the meaning of *Origen* in his eighth Book against *Celsus*, p. 399. Where speaking of the holy Eucharist he says, that therein [“ we eat Bread by prayer (i. e. by the prayer of Consecration for the descent of the divine Spirit upon it) “ made a certain holy Body, which also “ sanctifies those, who with a sound or “ sincere purpose of Heart use it.”] But that neither *Justin Martyr*, nor *Irenaeus*, nor *Origen* ever dream'd of the Transubstantiation of the Elements is most evident. For *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaeus*, do both of them plainly affirm, that by eating and drinking the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, *our Bodies are nourish'd*, and that the *Bread and Wine, are digested and turn'd into the Substance of our Bodies*; which to affirm of the glorify'd Body of Christ, were impious and blasphemous, and to affirm the same of the mere accidents of the Bread and Wine, would be very absurd and ridiculous. And *Origen* expressly saith, “ That what

“ we eat in the Eucharist is Bread, but  
“ Bread sanctify’d and made holy by  
“ Prayer, and which by the divine Vir-  
“ tue that accompanies it, sanctifieth all  
“ those who worthily receive it. He  
that would see more of this Notion of  
the ancient Fathers, and particularly  
those places of *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaeus*  
fully clear’d and vindicated, from the  
forced and absurd glosses of the Romani-  
sts, may consult my learned Friend,  
Mr. *Grabe*, in his Notes upon *Justin*  
*Martyr*’s first Apology, of his own Edi-  
tion, p. 128, 129. but especially in his  
large and elaborate Annotation upon  
*Irenaeus*, lib. 4. cap. 34.

I shall dismiss this Article with this  
one only observation, that after the pro-  
digious Doctrine of Transubstantiation  
was confirm’d by the first *Lateran* Coun-  
cil, there were many in the Communion  
of the Church of *Rome*, who could not  
digest it, did not in truth believe it,  
and wish’d from their Hearts that their  
Church had never defin’d it. For this  
we have the ample Testimonies of very  
eminent Writers of that Church. “ The  
“ conversion of the Bread and Wine into  
“ Christ’s Body and Blood, saith *Caje-*  
“ *tan*, par. 3. qu. 75. Article 1. all of  
“ us

“ us do teach in Words, but in Deed many  
“ deny it, thinking nothing less. These  
“ are diversely divided one from another.  
“ For some by the **Conversion** that is in  
“ the **Sacrament**, understand nothing but  
“ identity of place, that is, that the  
“ Bread is therefore said to be made the  
“ Body of Christ, because where the  
“ Bread is, the Body of Christ becomes  
“ present also. Others understand by  
“ the word *conversion*, nothing else but  
“ the order of Succession, that is, that  
“ the Body succeedeth and is under the  
“ veils of accidents, under which the  
“ Bread, which they suppose to be an-  
“ nihilated, was before. *Occam, Centi-  
logii conclus. cap. 19.* faith, “ There are  
“ three Opinions about **Transubstantia-  
tion**, of which the first supposeth a  
“ conversion of the sacramental Elements,  
“ the second the Annihilation, the third  
“ affirmeth the Bread to be in such man-  
“ ner transubstantiated into the Body of  
“ Christ, that it is no way chang'd in  
“ substance, or substantially converted  
“ into Christ's Body, or doth cease to  
“ be, but only that the Body of Christ  
“ in every part of it, becomes present  
“ in every part of the Bread. *Walden-  
sis, Tom. 2. de Sacram. Eucharistiae,*

34 *Transubstantiation doubted, &c.*

cap. 19. reports out of *Christopolitanus Zacharias* his Book, Entituled *Quatuor unum*, " That there were some, perhaps many, but hardly to be discern'd and noted, who thought still as *Berengarius* did. The same *Waldensis*, in the same Book, cap. 64. faith, " That some supposed the conversion that is in the Sacrament, to be, in that the Bread and Wine are assum'd into the unity of Christ's Person ; some thought it to be by way of impanation, and some by way of figurative and tropical appellation. The first and second of these Opinions, found the better entertainment in some Mens minds, because they grant the essential presence of Christ's Body, and yet deny not the presence of the Bread still remaining, to sustain the appearing accidents. These Opinions he reports to have been very acceptable to many, not without sighs, wishing the Church had decreed that Men should follow one of them.

It cannot be doubted, but that there are at this day, many in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, who are in the same perplexity about this Article of *Transubstantiation*, and have the same wishes,

wishes, that their Church had never made it an Article of their Faith; for the absurdities of Transubstantiation, and the reason of Mankind, are still the same. Now what a lamentable condition are they in, who are forced to profess (yea and all Ecclesiasticks now by the *Trent Confession* in the most solemn manner to swear) that they believe what they cannot for their Hearts believe; whose Consciences, between the determinations of their Church, and the dictates of their own reason, yea and sense too, are continually ground, as between two Milstones! I have been long upon this Article, but shall be more brief on the next.

The next Article is this: "I confess " also, that under one kind only, whole " and entire Christ, and the whole Sa- " crament is received. Now this Article of the *sufficiency of the Sacrament of the Eucharist taken only in one kind*, as it refers to, and is design'd to justify the practice of the *Roman Church*, in the constant and publick administration of the Sacrament to all the Laity only in one kind, *viz.* the Bread, denying them the Cup; is manifestly against our Saviour's first Institution of the Sacra-

ment, against Apostolical Practice, and the Usage of the Universal Church of Christ for a thousand Years, as is confessed by diverse learned Men of the Roman Communion. And yet according to the *Trent* Creed, all Men are damn'd that do not assent to the insolent (and as I may justly term it) *Antichristian* Decree of the *Roman* Church in this point. And who can without astonishment reflect on the stiffness, and obstinacy, and uncharitableness of the *Trent*-Fathers in this matter ! Before they met, when it was noised, that a Council should be called to redress the manifold Abuses and Corruptions that were in the Church, it was the longing expectation, and earnest desire of many good Men, that amongst other things, the Communion in both kinds might be restor'd to the Laity. There were a multitude of pious Souls, as it were upon their knees before them, thirsting after the Cup of Blessing, and earnestly begging for an entire Sacrament. But those *Duri Patres*, those hard-hearted Fathers had no compassion on them, turn'd a deaf ear to their loud crys and supplications, only bidding them believe for the future (what they could not believe) that half the Sacrament

ment was every whit as good as the whole.

Immediately follows this Article, " I  
" firmly hold that there is a Purgatory,  
" and that the Souls detained there, are  
" relieved by the Prayers of the Faithful.  
Now this Article of a *Purgatory after  
this Life*, as it is understood and taught  
by the *Roman Church* (that is, to be a  
place and state of misery and torment,  
whereinto many faithful Souls go pre-  
sently after Death, and there remain till  
they are throughly purged from their  
dross, or delivered thence by Masses,  
Indulgences, &c.) is contrary to Scrip-  
ture, and the sense of the *Catholick  
Church* for at least the first *four Centu-  
ries*, as I have at large proved in a Dis-  
course concerning the *State of the Souls  
of Men in the interval between Death  
and the Resurrection*: Which I am rea-  
dy to communicate to *Monsieur de  
Meaux* if he shall desire it. Indeed the  
Doctrine of *Purgatory* is not only an  
Error, but a dangerous one too, (which  
I am verily persuaded) hath betray'd a  
multitude of Souls into eternal perdi-  
tion, who might have escaped Hell, if  
they had not depended upon an after-  
game in *Purgatory*. But this Article  
being

being very gainful to the *Roman Clergy*, must above others, be held fast, and constantly maintain'd and defended.

“ I firmly hold it.

Prayers for the dead, as founded on the Hypothesis of Purgatory (and we no otherwise reject them) fall together with it. The Prayers for the dead used in the ancient Church (thoſe I mean that were more properly Prayers, *i. e.* either deprecaſions, or petitions) were of two sorts, either the common and general commemoration of all the Faithful at the oblation of the h̄oly Eucharist, or the particular Prayers used at the Funerals of any of the Faithful lately deceased.

The former reſpected their final Absolution, and the Consummation of their Blisſ at the Resurrection; like as that our Church uſeth both in the Office for the Communion, and in that for the Burial of the Dead: Which indeed ſeems to be no more than what we daily pray for in that petition of the Lord's Prayer (if we rightly understand it) *Thy Kingdom come.* The latter were also charitable omens, and good wiſhes of the Faithful living, as it were accompanying the Soul of the deceased to the joys of Paradise, of which they believed it already

already possess'd, as the ancient Author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in his last Chapter of that Book plainly informs us. In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced Person attentively observe the Prayers for the Dead in the most undoubtedy ancient Liturgies, especially those in the *Clementine Liturgy*, and those mentioned in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*; and he will be so far from believing the *Roman Purgatory* upon the account of those Prayers, that he must needs see they make directly against it. For they all run (as even that Prayer for the Dead, which is unadvisedly left by the *Romanists* in their own *Canon of the Mass*, as a Testimony against themselves) in this Form: *For all that are in peace or at rest in the Lord.* Now how can they be said to be in peace or at rest in the Lord, who are supposed to be in a state of Misery and Torment?

The next Article is this: "As also "that the Saints reigning together with "Christ, are to be venerated and invo- "ked, and that they offer up Prayers to "God for us; and that their Relicks "are to be venerated. Now for the Worship and Invocation of *Saints deceased*, there is no ground or foundation in the

the Holy Scriptures, no Precept, no Example. Nay it is by evident consequence forbidden in the prohibition of the Worship and Invocation of Angels, *Col. 2. v. 18.* with which Text compare the 35 *Canon* of the Council of *Laodicea*, and the judgment of the learned Father *Theodore* concerning it, who flourished shortly after that Council. He in his Notes upon that Text of St. *Paul*, hath these express words, *The Synod met at Laodicea in Phrygia made a Law forbidding Men to pray even to the Angels.* See also *Zonaras* upon the same Canon. He as well as *Theodore* long before him, rightly judged, that both in the Text of St. *Paul*, and in the *Laodicean Canon*, all Prayers to Angels are forbidden. Now if we must not pray to Angels, then much less may we pray to Saints. The Angels are ministering Spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be *Heirs of Salvation*: They watch over us, and are frequently present with us, nay they are *internunci*, Messengers between God and us, conveying God's Blessings to us and our Prayers to God, *Act. 10. & 4. Apoc. 8. & 3.* none of which things are any where affirm'd of the

the deceased Saints. And yet we must not pray, even to the Angels.

Hear also *Origen* who lived long before the *Laodicean Council*, delivering the sense of the Church of his time in this matter, *lib. 5. contra Cels. p. 233. Edit. Cantab.* where he excellently discourses against the religious Worship and Invocation of Angels; in opposition to which, he first lays down this as a received Doctrine among all Catholick Christians, "That all Prayers, all Supplications, "Deprecations and Thanksgivings, are "to be offer'd to God the Lord of all, "by the Chief High Priest, who is above "all Angels, the living Word, and God. And presently after he shews the folly and unreasonableness of praying to Angels upon several accounts. As first, because the particular knowledge of Angels, and what offices they severally perform, is a secret which we cannot reach to; which is the very reason which *St. Paul* suggests in the Text before-mentioned, that whosoever Worships and Invocates the Angels, doth *intrude into those things which he hath not seen*. From whence we may easily gather, that *Origen* in this discourse of his, had an eye to that Text of *St. Paul*, and understood it as

we

we do, to be a prohibition of all Prayer to Angels. 2. He argues that if we should suppose that we could attain such particular knowledge of the Angels, yet it would not be lawful for us to pray to them, or any other, save to God the Lord of all, who alone is all sufficient, abundantly able to supply all our wants and necessities, through our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, his Word, Wisdom and Truth. Lastly, He reasons to this effect, that the best way to gain the good will of those blessed Spirits, is not to pray to them, but to imitate them by paying our Devotions to God alone, as they do. Hear the same *Origen*, lib. 8. p. 402. where to *Celsus* talking of those Spirits that preside over the affairs of Men here below, who were thought to be appeased only by Prayers to them in a barbarous Language, he answers with derision, and tells him, he forgot with whom he had to do, and that he was speaking to Christians, who *pray to God alone thro' Jesus*. And then he adds, that the genuine Christians in their prayers to God, used no barbarous words, but prayed to him in the Language of their respective Countries, the Greek Christians in the Greek Tongue,

the

the *Romans* in the *Roman* Language, as knowing that the God to whom they prayed, understood all Tongues and Languages, and heard and accepted their Prayers in their several Languages, as well as if they had address'd themselves to him in one and the same Language. Again in the same Book, p. 420. to *Celsus* discoursing much after the same rate, he gives this excellent answer: "The "one God is to be attor'd by us, the "Lord of all, and must be entreated "to be propitious to us, Piety and Pray- "ers being the best means of appeasing "him. And if *Celsus* would have others "applied to after him, let him assure "himself, that as the Body's Motion "unavoidably moves its Shadow, so "likewise when God is once become "propitious to any, all his Angels, Souls, "and Spirits, will become Friends to "such an one. From these Testimonies of *Origen*, to which more might be added, it is very evident that the Catholick Christians of his time, made no Prayers either to Angels or Saints, but directed all their Prayers to God, through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Indeed, against the Invocation of Angels and Saints, we have the

con-

concurrent Testimonies of all the Catholic Fathers of the first three Centuries at least. For as to that Testimony of *Justin Martyr*, in his second (or rather first) Apology for the Christians, p. 56. alledged by *Bellarmin*, and others of his Party, for the worshipping of Angels as practised in the Primitive Times of the Church: I have given a clear account of it, *Def. Fid. Nic.* §. 2. c. 4. §. 8. where I have evidently proved that place of *Justin* to be so far from giving any countenance to the Religious Worship of Angels, that it makes directly against it. And the like may be easily shewn of the other Allegations of *Bellarmin* out of the Primitive Fathers.

To conclude: Look into the most ancient Liturgies, as particularly that described in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and the *Clementine Liturgy*, contain'd in the Book, Intituled, the *Apostolical Constitutions*; and you will not find in them one Prayer of any sort to Angels or Saints, no not so much as an oblique Prayer, (as they term it,) i. e. a Prayer directed to God, that he would hear the intercession of Angels and Saints for us. And yet after all this, they are for ever damn'd by the *Trent Creed*, who do not hold

hold and practise the Invocation of the Saints deceased. For this is one of the Articles of that Creed, without the belief whereof, they tell us, *none can be saved*: That is, all are damned who pray unto God alone through Christ the Mediator, as the Scripture directs, and the Catholick Church of the first and best Ages hath practised.

As to what follows, *that the Saints departed do offer up their Prayers to God for us*; if it be understood of the intercession of the Saints in general, we deny it not. But this is no reason why we should pray to them to pray for us. Nay, on the contrary, if the deceased Saints do of their own accord, and out of their perfect Charity pray for us, what need we be so solicitous to call upon them for their Prayers, especially, when our Reason and Scripture also tell us, that we are out of their hearing, and that they do not, cannot know our particular Wants and Necessities? For, as to what the Romanists tell us of the *Glass of the Trinity*, and extraordinary *Revelations*, they are bold presumptuous Conjectures, destitute of any ground or colour from Reason or Scripture, and indeed are inconsistent with one another.

To

To be sure, that conceit of the *Glass of the Trinity*, would never have passed with the Fathers of the first Ages: For they generally held, *That the Souls of the Righteous* (some indeed excepted of the Souls of the Martyrs,) *do not presently after Death ascend to the third Heaven, but go to a place and state of inferior Bliss and Happiness*, (which they commonly call by the Name of *Paradise*, tho' where it is situated they do not all agree) *and there remain till the Resurrection of their Bodies*; *after which, they shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, and there for ever enjoy that consummate Bliss and Happiness which consists in that clear Vision of God, which the holy Scripture calls seeing him Face to Face*. And indeed, their distinction of *Paradise*, (the receptacle of holy Souls presently after Death,) from the third Heaven, seems to have firm ground in the New Testament. *Vid. Luke 23.43. 2 Cor. 12. and 2. 3, 4. and Grot. in Loca;* and was undoubtedly received in the Church of God, before the coming of the Lord in the Flesh. However, this was a current Doctrine in the Christian Church for many Ages; till at length the *Popish Council of Florence* boldly determin'd

termin'd the contrary, defining, *That those Souls, which having contracted the blemish of Sin, being either in their Bodies, or out of them, purged from it, are presently received into Heaven, and there clearly behold God himself, one God in three Persons, as he is.* This Decree they craftily made, partly to establish the Superstition of praying to Saints deceased, whom they would make us to believe to see and know all our Necessities and Concerns in *speculo Trinitatis*, as was said before, and so to be fit Objects of our religious Invocation, partly and chiefly to confirm the Doctrine of Purgatory, and that the Prayers of the ancient Church for the Dead, might be thought to be founded upon a supposition that the Souls of some, nay, most faithful Persons after Death, go into a place of grievous Torment, out of which they may be delivered by the Prayers, Masses, and Alms of the Living. But this by the way.

It is added in the Creed, *That not only the Saints themselves, but also their Reliques are to be worship'd.* A strange definition of the Trent Fathers, especially if we consider the time when it was made; a time when the best and wisest

Men

Men in the *Roman* Communion sadly complain'd of the vile Cheat put upon the poor ignorant People, by shewing them I know not what Reliques of Saints, and drawing them to the Worship of them, only for Gain's sake, and to pick their Pockets. Hear the Judgment of the learned and pious *Cassander*, as to this Article : " Seeing there are a " small number of true and approved " Reliques, especially in these Provin- " ces, and many of those which are made " shew of, are too apparently liable to " Suspicion, and the frequenting and " veneration of them is of little service " to true Piety and Devotion, though of " very much to Superstition or Gain; it " seems to me much more proper, that " all such Ostentation of Miracles were " forborn, and the People were invited " to Worship the true Reliques of " Saints; that is, the Examples of Pie- " ty and Virtue they have left behind " them for our Imitation, as is recorded " in what has been written either by " them, or of them.

The next Article of the *Trent* Creed is this: " I most firmly assert, that the " Images of Christ, and the ever Virgin, " Mother of God, and other Saints, are " to

" to be had and retain'd, and that due  
" Honour and Veneration are to be given  
" them. A doughty Article indeed,  
worthy to be usher'd in with a *Firmissime affero!* But is this really an Article  
of the Catholick Christian Faith, without the belief whereof there is no Salvation ? What then is become again of the Catholick Church of the first three Centuries and downwards ? For it is certain, that the Church of those Days never allowed the use of Images in her Oratories or Conventicles, much less the Adoration and Worship of them. This appears from what we read of *Adrian the Roman Emperour*, related by *Ælius Lampridius* in the Life of *Alexander Severus*, that he favouring the Christians, and willing to gratifie them in their way of Worship, commanded that they should have Temples built for them without any Images in them ; as well knowing their utter aversation to the setting up of Images in the places of their religious Worship. This also more plainly appears from the Writings of the Christian Apologists of those Times against the Heathens objecting to them, that they had no Images that they worship'd, and consequently, that they were Atheists, and

C wor-

50 *The Worship of Images.*

worship'd no God at all; for they thought there could be no religious Worship of any thing, without some visible Image of the Object to be worship'd, and finding no Image at all, of any sort in the Oratories of the Christians, they concluded that the Christians worship'd no Deity. Now our Apologists are so far from pleading to this Objection, that the Christians had Images in their places of Worship, that they answer without any distinction, by way of concession, and that not only granting that they had no Images, but affirming they ought not to have them, and condemn'd the Gentiles which had. See *Minutius Felix, Arnobius and Lactantius.*

In the fourth Century indeed, there were some attempts to bring in Pictures into the Christian Oratories, but they were presently check'd and repress'd by the Governors of the Church, as appears from the 36th Canon of the Council of *Eliberis in Spain*, and from the Relation which *Epiphanius* gives us, (who flourish'd towards the end of the fourth Century,) in his Epistle to *John Bishop of Jerusalem*, translated by *St. Jerome* out of *Greek* into *Latin*. *Tom. 2. Oper. Hieronymi*; where he tells *John of Jerusalem*,

rusalem, that going into a Church in the Village of *Anablatba* to pray, he found there a Picture hanging up, which (tho' it were out of his own Diocese,) he cut in pieces, as being scandalous and contrary to the holy Scriptures; and desires *John* to take care for the future, that no such Pictures be hung up in any Church under his Jurisdiction. The words of *Epiphanius* are these: "At my entrance into the Church to pray, I saw there a Veil hanging within the Doors of the same Church, Died and Painted, and having the Image as it were of Christ, or some Saint, for I do not well remember whose it was. When therefore I had seen this Image of a Man hanging in the Church of Christ, against the Authority of the Scriptures, I tore it in pieces, and advised the Keepers of the place to wrap therewith a poor dead Man, and carry him to burial in it. And whereas they on the other hand murmured, saying, that if he would tear the Veil, he ought in Justice to change it, and give them another for it: I no sooner heard this, but I promised to give them one, and that I would send it presently. However, some little time past,

“whilst I was seeking after the best  
“Veil, to send them it; for I thought I  
“must send one from *Cyprus*. But now  
“I have sent such as I could meet with;  
“and I beseech thee, command the Pres-  
“byters of that place to receive the Veil  
“we have sent from the Bearer, and to  
“command for the future, that no such  
“Veils as are contrary to our Religion,  
“be hung up in the Church of Christ.  
“For it becomes thy Worth to have the  
“greater care in this respect, that thou  
“mayest take away all such scrupulofi-  
“ty as is unworthy of the Christian  
“Church, and the People committed to  
“thy charge. The Authority of this  
Epistle is vindicated from the Cavils of  
*Bellarmin*, by the learned *Andrew Rivet*,  
in his *Criticæ Sacr. Spec. lib. 3. cap. 29.*  
How would the Zeal of this great and  
good Bishop have been inflam'd, if he  
had seen what we now a-days see, not  
only Pictures, but massie Images in  
Churches, and People praying, kneeling,  
and burning Incense before them.

By what means Image-Worship in  
After-Ages enter'd into the Church, is  
not so easie to tell; nor is it very neces-  
sary. But this is certain, that about  
the beginning of the eighth Century it  
had

had gotten great ground. For in the Year of our Lord 754, in the Reign of Constantine, nick-nam'd *Copronymus*, a General Council was conven'd at Constantinople, consisting of 338 Bishops, declaring it self the seventh General Council. *Vide Syn. CP. in Ad. Syn. Nic. 2. p. 621. Edit. Col. An. 1618.* This Synod expressly condemn'd all Worship of Images, decreeing it to be abominable; and that all Images, of whatsoever Matter or Colour they were made, should be cast out of all Christian Churches. *Ibid. p. 965.* And presently after, they decree severe Punishments to any Man that should dare from thence forward, to make, worship, or set up in the Church, or in his own House, any such Image, as being a transgressor of the Commandment of God, and an enemy to the Doctrine of the Fathers. Where observe, that the Bishops of this Council condemn all Image-Worship, as contrary both to Scripture, and also to the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Church that were before them, as indeed we have already shewn it to be. In this Council, Germanus Bishop of Constantinople, George Cyprius, and Damascene a Monk, who were the chief sticklers for Image-Worship, were excommunicated.

About 30 Years after, *viz.* *An. 787.* another Council met at *Constantinople* first, and was afterwards translated to *Nice*, in which the Decree of the former Synod was exploded, and Image-Worship first establish'd in the Church. This Council was call'd by the Empress *Irene* a bigotted Image-Worshipper: She had so great an influence upon this Synod, that partly by her Persuasions, partly by her Threatnings, several Bishops who in the former Synod had condemn'd Image-Worship, were now for it. Among these, *Basilius* Bishop of *Ancyra*, *Theodorus* Bishop of *Myra*, and *Theodosius* Bishop of *Amorium*, were brought in as *Pompa Cirencenses*, and offer'd to this Council their Letters supplicant, confessing that they had sinn'd in condemning the Worship of Images in the Synod convened by *Constantinus Copronymus*: *Dux fæmina facti*. It was a Woman that first brought this childish Worship (the great *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* calls it *Puparum cultum, Baby-Worship*,) into the Church of Christ. The Bishops in this Synod, being destitute of Scripture Proof and Authentick Tradition for their Image-Worship, betook *Car. Mag.* themselves to certain *Apollib. 3. c. 3.* *cryptal and ridiculous Stories*, as

as *Charles the Great* observ'd. For in this Synod, a Letter from *Adrian Bishop of Rome*, to *Constantine and Irene*, was produced, and openly read, full of the most ridiculous Fables, as particularly concerning the Leprosie of *Constantine the Great* before his Conversion; the barbarous Remedy that he sought after by the Blood of innocent Babes, the appearing of *St. Peter and St. Paul* to him in a Dream, advising him to send for Pope *Sylvester*, who, upon we know not what Persecution raised by *Constantine* against the *Christians*, was fled with his Clergy to the Mountain *Soracte*, and there hid themselves in the Caves thereof; that when *Sylvester* came to him, he commanded his Deacons to produce the Images of *St. Peter and Paul*, which as soon as the Emperour saw, he cryed out aloud, *These are the very Images I saw in my Dream; I am convinced, I believe, and desire the Laver of Baptism*; which, when he had received, he was immediately cured of his Leprosie: That thereupon, in gratitude for the benefit he had received, he order'd Churches to be built for the *Christians*, whose Walls and Pillars should be adorn'd with the holy Images of *Christ and the Saints*. Was there

ever such a Legend offer'd to a Synod of Bishops? And yet this Letter of *Adrian* was accepted, and approved of by the whole Council. Had none of them read the Life of *Constantine*, written by *Eusebius*?

Wherefore, about seven Years after, *viz. An. 794*, this *Nicene Synod* was condemn'd, and abdicated, by a Council of about 300 Bishops conven'd at *Frankford* by *Charles the Great*, King of *France*. In this Synod, were present not only the Bishops of *France*, but also of *Germany* and *Lombardy*, as Provinces subdued to the King of *France*. Pope *Adrian* also sent his Legates thither, and the Great *Charles* himself honoured this Council with his Presence.

The Romanists are hard put to it to ward the stroke of this Council against the Worshippers of Images. They have

several evasions. *Genebrard*

*lib. 3. Chron.*

*An. 794.*

*lib. 2. de Imag.*

*cap. 14.*

and *Bellarmino* tell us that

the Fathers at *Frankford*

mistook the meaning of the

2d *Nicene Council*, as think-

ing they had decreed, “*The Worship* “*due to God alone* to be given to the Images of the Saints, which they were very far from doing. But it is far more probable that *Genebrard* and *Bellarmino* were both

both grossly mistaken. There were assembled in this Council almost all the learned Bishops of the West; they had the Acts of the 2d *Nicene Synod* before them, and diligently perused them, and upon examination condemn'd them as to the point of Image-Worship. Besides, our *Alcuinus*, The Emperor's Tutor, the most learned Man of that Age, had before so fully examin'd the *Nicene Acts*, that he wrote a learned Discourse against them, and notably refuted them, as we shall hear by and by. Lastly, it is certain that the Fathers of the Council of *Frankford* did not condemn only *Cultum latræ* to be given to Images, but all manner of religious Worship.

Others therefore tell us that they who urge the Testimony of the *Frankford Synod* against Image-Worship are utterly mistaken; that the Synod which the Fathers at *Frankford* condemn'd was not the Council of *Nice*, but that of *Constantinople* under *Constantinus Copronymus*; that the *Frankford Synod* perfectly agreed with the Fathers of the *Nicene Council*, and confirm'd the Worship of Images. This is strange news indeed

*Surius in adm.*  
*ad Lect. pro*  
*Syn. Frank.*  
*Coriolanus in*  
*Con. Frank. ad*  
*An. 794.*

indeed, but it is far from being true. The mistake of those Writers who tell us this (if it were a mistake in them, and not a wilful prevarication) arose from hence, that the Synod which established Image-Worship met first (as I noted before) at *Constantinople*, tho' it was afterwards translated to *Nice*; and so might be truly said to be a Council convened at *Constantinople*, and thereupon be mistaken for that Council of *Constantinople*, which was convened by *Constantinus Copronymus*, which was indeed confirm'd by the *Frankford* Fathers. But that it was the second Council of *Nice*, that was condemn'd by the Synod at *Frankford*, and that upon this very account that it had introduced Image-Worship into the Church, we have abundant evidence.

For this is testified not only by *Walfridius Strabo*, but also by *Ado Viennensis* and *Regino Pruniensis* in their Histories; with whom *Abbas Uspurgensis* agrees in his Chronicle, where he thus writes: "In the Year 793, whilst *Charles* "was celebrating the Feast of *Easter* in "France, a numerous Synod of Bishops "was gathered together out of all the "Provinces of the Realm, the Legates "of Pope *Adrian* were there also in his "stead.

“Istead. In this Synod the Heresie of a  
“certain Bishop named *Felix* was con-  
“demned. — The Synod likewise  
“which a few Years before met at  
“*Constantinople*, under *Irene* and *Con-  
“stantine* her Son, and was call’d the  
“seventh General Council, was univer-  
“sally renounced as useles, that so it  
“might neither be stiled the seventh, nor  
“by any other name. That the Council  
here said to be condemned by the *Frank-  
ford* Synod was the second Council of  
*Nice* is evident, for it is expresly said to  
be the Council conven’d under the Em-  
press *Irene*, and *Constantine* her Son, and  
that but a few Years before. But it is  
said to be conven’d at *Constantinople* be-  
cause there indeed it first met, as was  
noted before.

Add to this the Testimony of *Hincmar*  
of *Rhemes*, an Author in all respects most  
worthy of credit in this matter: “In  
“the time of the Emperor  
“*Charlemaign*, a General Sy- Cap. 20.  
“nod was held in *France* by  
“order of the Apostolick See, the said  
“Emperor convening it. And according  
“to the direktion of the holy Scriptures,  
“and the Tradition of the Ancients, the  
“Greek Synod was condemned and wholly  
“laid

“ laid aside. Of the Condemnation where-  
 “ of a Volume of no small size was sent  
 “ from the same Emperor to *Rome* by some  
 “ of the Bishops, and I my self have read  
 “ it in the Palace in my younger days.

In the same Chapter he afterwards adds, “ Wherefore by the Authority of  
 “ this Synod, the Worship of Images was  
 “ somewhat restrained : Yet not so, but  
 “ that *Adrian* and the other Bishops per-  
 “ severed in their Opinion ; and after the  
 “ Death of *Charles*, most earnestly pro-  
 “ moted their Puppet-Worship: Insomuch  
 “ that *Lewis*, *Charles*’s Son, wrote a  
 “ Book, wherein he fell much sharper  
 “ upon the Worship of Images than his  
 “ Father had done.

With what indignation and abhor-  
 rence the Decree of the *Nicene Pseudo  
 Synod* was received by our *British Church*,  
 our Historians tell us. Hear *Roger Hove-*

*den*. “ *Charles* King of

*Part 1. Annal ad Ann. 792.* “ *France*, sent the Book of

*Matth. West. ad Ann. 793.* “ the Council, directed to

“ himself from *Constanti-*

“ *nople*, into *Britain* ; in

“ which Book, alas ! alas !

“ many things were found unagreeable,

“ and contrary to the true Faith ; espe-

“ cially, that by the unanimous asserti-

“ on

“ on of almost all the Eastern Doctors,  
“ that is to say, of no less than Three  
“ Hundred or more Bishops, the Wor-  
“ ship of Images was confirmed : Which  
“ the Church of God utterly abomina-  
“ ted. Against which, *Alcuinus* wrote  
“ an Epistle wonderfully supported with  
“ Authorities out of the Holy Scriptures,  
“ and brought it with the same Book to  
“ the King of *France*, in the Name of  
“ our Bishops and Princes.

From whence it appears, that the *Nicene A&ts* sent from *Constantinople* to *Charles the Great*, were by him before the *Frankford Synod* first sent to *Britain* ; and being examin'd, and abundantly refuted, and that from the Holy Scriptures, by our most learned *Alcuinus*, were carried back again, together with that *Refutation* of them, to the *Emperour* in the Name of our Bishops and Princes : So that even *then*, the *British Church* was Protestant in this Article concerning Image-Worship.

And indeed, I am persuaded that no Man of Judgment and Integrity, that hath been conversant in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Writings of the more ancient Doctors of the Church, will be able to read those A&ts of the *Pseudo-Synod*

*Synod of Nice*, without Indignation and abhorrence of it, when he observes upon what ridiculous Fables, gross Misinterpretations of Scripture, Falsifications, and impertinent Allegations of the antient Fathers, the Bishops of that Convention built their Decree concerning Image - Worship. Notwithstanding all this, the Bishops at *Trent* chose to follow that wretched Synod, and have decreed, and that as an Article of Faith, most firmly to be asserted, *that the Images of Christ and the Saints are to be retain'd, yea, and worship'd too.* May not one presume to ask why? What necessity is there of this? Cannot the Church of Christ be as well without these Images, and this Image-Worship now, as it was in the more antient and purer Times of it? Nay, may we not farther ask, what good use *at all* can be made of these Images and this Image-Worship? The Answer of the *Romanists* here is, that these Images are *Libri Laicorum, & Idiotarum, Books fit to instruct the Ignorant Laity* that cannot read the holy Scriptures, and apt to raise Devotion in them. But to this Plea for Image-Worship, made use of by *Wading* a Jesuit of *Antwerp*, his learned Antagonist returns this

this excellent Answer, with which I shall conclude what I have to say upon this Article : " I deny not but Images may be of use to the stupid Vulgar, who are led only by their Senses, for raising their Devotion at the sight of them ; but see, I pray thee, whether many more and greater Disadvantages are not to be feared from the use and worship of them. For in the first place, it is scarce possible but that the ignorant and profane Vulgar will be apt hence to imbibe filthy and sordid

*Episcopii Resp.  
ad Epist. Pet.  
Wadingi de  
cultu Imag.  
cap. 8.*

" Notions of God and the Saints, will depend upon these Images and Statues as their Tutelar Gods, will pay them as bad or worse Adoration than the Heathens paid to their Abominations ; and, lastly, will grow mere Brutes by using Images instead of Books, as if there were no need of understanding more than these will teach them. This, were it proper, might be abundantly confirmed : But I only appeal to Experience, as above all Exception. In the next place, it cannot be but the Jews must be most intolerably scandalized at the use and worship of Images, " and

“ and will be the more averse to all  
“ thoughts of ever embracing of Christi-  
“ anity, inasmuch as the worship of a  
“ Statue or Image, is a dreadful, hei-  
“ nous, and enormous Crime with them.  
“ They most firmly believe, that he can  
“ never be the *Messias*, whose Disciples  
“ allow as lawful what is so directly  
“ contrary to the Divine Law. And this  
“ is to be reckoned so much the greater  
“ Evil, because it is almost the principal  
“ occasion of all the *Jews* Indignation  
“ against Christ and Christians; so that  
“ their Conversion to our Religion, is in  
“ my Opinion to be despaired of, unless  
“ this Stumbling-block be first taken out  
“ of the way. Thirdly, Offence will  
“ hereby be inevitably given to an infinite  
“ number of Christians, and they will  
“ be irreconcilably alienated from your  
“ Church, whilst having their Minds  
“ possessed with a true sense of the Di-  
“ vine Prohibition, they think they have  
“ just reason to look upon Image-Wor-  
“ ship as no better than Idolatry: When  
“ also at the same time, those that con-  
“ tend for it do not believe it necessary  
“ by reason of any Divine Command,  
“ yet nevertheless press it as much as in  
“ them lies upon Mens Consciences, as  
“ though

“ though it were necessary. Who sees  
“ not what great Evils and Inconvenien-  
“ ces these are? The ignorant People  
“ are tempted to continue in their pro-  
“ phane Sottishness; the *Jews* in their  
“ destructive Error; *Christians* in their  
“ deplorable Schism; and all good Men  
“ in an endless despair of ever seeing an  
“ Amendment. So that I need not fear  
“ to make thy self the Judge between  
“ us; and beg thee to tell me seriously,  
“ whether the single advantage of using  
“ and worshiping Images will equal, not  
“ to say preponderate, these so many and  
“ so great Mischiefs.

The next Article is concerning Papal Indulgences, in these words: “ I also affirm, that the power of granting Indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and the use of them tends very much to the Salvation of Christians. Now the Doctrine of Indulgences, as it was before the Council of *Trent*, and hath been since taught in the Church of *Rome*, is big with gross Errors. It depends on the Fiction of Purgatory; it supposeth a superfluity of the Satisfaction of the Saints; which being jumbled together, (*for reo referens*) with the Merits and Satisfaction of our Saviour, make up

up one Treasury of the Church ; that the Bishop of *Rome* keeps the Key of it, as having the sole power of granting Indulgences, either by himself immediately, or by others commission'd from him : Lastly, it very absurdly extends the effect of the power of the Keys, left by Christ in his Church, to Men in the other World. Is not this now a Doctrine worthy of a place in our Creed, and to be made an Article of the Catholick Faith ? That the Doctrine and Use of Indulgences were never heard of in the Church of Christ for many hundreds of Years, is certain, and confessed too by divers learned Men of the Roman Communion. I shall cite only one of them, but he such a one as may be *instar omnium*. Our *Roffensis*,

*Luther's* great Antagonist,  
*Act. 12. cont.* and *Rome's* Martyr, gives  
*Lutherum.* us this Account of Indul-  
gences : " Many perhaps  
" are tempted not to rely much upon In-  
" dulgences, upon this consideration, that  
" the use of them appears to be new, and  
" very lately known amongst Christians.  
" To whom I answer, It is not very cer-  
" tain who was the first Author of them.  
" The Doctrine of Purgatory was rarely,  
" it at all, heard of amongst the Ancients.  
" And

"And to this very Day, the Greeks be-  
"lieve it not. Nor was the belief either  
"of Purgatory or Indulgences so necessa-  
"ry in the Primitive Church as it is now.  
"So long as Men were unconcerned about  
"Purgatory, no body enquired after In-  
"dulgences: For upon that depends all  
"the worth of Indulgences. Take away  
"Purgatory, and there is no more need  
"of these. Seeing therefore Purgatory,  
"was so lately known, and received in  
"the universal Church, who will wonder  
"that in the first Ages of Christianity In-  
"dulgences were not made use of?

In this indeed the Bishop seems to be mistaken, that he thought the Doctrine of Purgatory and the Use of Indulgences to be coeval, and that the latter immediately and necessarily follows from the former. It is true, Purgatory and Papal Indulgences are both of them later Inventions. But I think, when Men were first seduced to a belief of Purgatory, they were not yet presently so foolish, as to think that any one mortal Man had power by his Pardons to deliver Men out of it. Antichristianism in the Roman Church did not presently come to that maturity, nor was the Papal Power so soon advanced to that prodigious height and greatness.

greatness. It was at first more reasonably judged, that the supposed miserable Souls in Purgatory, were to receive their relief, rather from the Prayers of the Church, together with the Prayers, Almsdeeds, and good Works of their living Friends and Relations.

To sum up this matter in short: Papal Indulgences, as taught and used in the Church of *Rome*, (to which this Article of the *Trent* Creed must have reference; or else let any Man tell me, what the meaning of it is) if they were freely granted, can by no means be justified and defended, but the merchandize and sale of them for Money is abominable. That such a vile trade of Indulgences hath been driven in the Church of *Rome*, cannot without the greatest impudence be denied, as long as the *Taxa Cancellariae Apostolice* is extant.

*Taxa Cancell.  
Apost. Paris.  
apud Tass.  
Denis. 1520.*

Of which filthy Book *Espenæus* a learned Doctor of the Roman Communion, thus sadly and most justly complains in *Epist. ad Tit. c. 1.* "There is exposed to sale, and easily to be had by any who will be at the charge of purchasing it, a Book openly and publicly Printed here, and which may be had

“ had now as well as formerly, entituled  
“ *The Tax of the Apostolical Chamber or  
Chancery*, whereby may be learned  
“ more sorts of Wickedness, than from  
“ all the Summists and the Summaries  
“ of all Vices, and a licence for most of  
“ them, but an absolution for all, is of-  
“ fered to such as will bid well for it.  
“ I spare names, for as one though at  
“ present I cannot well recollect who,  
“ says, the very repeating of them is of-  
“ fensive. It is wonderful that during  
“ this time and this Schism, such an in-  
“ famous kind of Index of so many, such  
“ foul and horrid Wickednesses, that I  
“ cannot imagine any more scandalous  
“ work is to be met with in *Germany*,  
“ or *Suitzerland*, or any of those Coun-  
“ tries that have withdrawn their obedi-  
“ ence to the Papal See, should not have  
“ been suppressed. So far have the Fact-  
“ ors from the *Roman* Communion been  
“ from suppressing it, that many new  
“ Impunities for such so gross Enormi-  
“ ties are granted, and the rest confirmed,  
“ in the Faculties of the Legates dis-  
“ patched to their several  
“ Countries. A little after *Eccl. 9.*  
he adds out of *Mantuan*,  
“ 'Tis sad to see how Money carries all  
“ things

“ things at Rome. And not very long before the Council of *Trent*, what a prodigious mass of Money Pope *Leo* raised by these Indulgences,

*Ad Ann. 1515.* the noble Historian *Thuanus* tells us: *Leo*, faith he

“ to the guilt of his Dispensations, added another and greater, when at the instigation of the Cardinal *Laurence Picius*, he every where exacted Monies in vast Sums, sending his Bulls through all the Kingdoms of Christendom, promising forgiveness of all their Sins, and eternal Life, at a price stated according to the quality of their Crimes.

In a Word, all sober Men cry'd shame at this abominable Cheat, imposed on the Souls of Men for whom Christ dyed. And if the Men that influenced and govern'd the *Trent* Convention, had had any true sense of Religion, they would have denounced an Anathema against this vile Doctrine and Practice, and not (as they have done) decreed, and that as an Article of Faith without any restriction or qualification, “ That the use of Indulgences is highly conducing to the Salvation of Christians. But they were the Pope's Vassals, and received their Instructi-

Instructions from *Rome* not to reform any thing, tho' never so much amiss, that tended to the Grandeur and Gain of that See.

The last Article I shall take notice of is contained in these words: "I acknowledge the holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and promise true obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, Successor to St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Here the Ecclesiastick swears to three great untruths one upon the neck of another. 1. *That the Roman Church is the Mother of all other Churches*; which is a manifest falsehood in matter of Fact. For every body knows, that the Church of *Jerusalem* was the first Mother Church, and is so called and acknowledged by the ancient Fathers. St. *Jerome* faith, "It was the Church founded at *Jerusalem*, that Comment. in Isai. 2. planted all the other Churches. And the Syndical Letters from the Council of *Constantinople* to *Damascus*, and the Western Bishops calls *Cyril* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, which is the Mother of all Churches. From this truly Theodo. Hist. Eccle. l.5.c.9. Mother

Mother Church divers other Churches were planted in the *East*, before the Gospel came to *Rome*; as particularly the Church of *Antioch*, where the Disciples were first called Christians. Upon the Persecution raised against the Church of *Jerusalem*, the Christians of that Church being dispersed and scattered abroad, soon spread the Gospel far and near through the *East*. And to come nearer home, it is affirmed by some learned Men of the Roman Church, that our *Britain* receiv'd the Gospel before *Rome*. For *Suarez*

*Defens. Fid.*  
*Cath. l. 1.*

confesseth that the Gospel was preached here from the first rising of it. And *Baronius* from some MSS. in the *Vatican* affixeth our Conversion to Christianity to the 35th Year of our Lord, which was near nine Years before the founding of the Roman Church. But if the credit of these MSS. be questionable, this however is evident, that our *Britain* did not receive her first Christianity from *Rome*, but from the *East*. This, I say, is evident from the Customs observed here from the beginning in the observation of *Easter*, and the administration of Baptism, different from the Roman use, but conform

form to the Oriental Churches. So that we may justly check the arrogance of the present Roman Church in the words of St. Paul to the proud *Corinthians*, setting up among themselves certain Customs, contrary to the Institutes of all other Churches. *Came the word*

*of God out from you?* Or *1 Cor. 14. 36.*  
*Came it to you only?* Q. d.

Are you the first and only Christians? Your Church the first and only Church of Christ? Yes say the Romanists our Church is the Mother of all other Churches. But this is apparently false, for the *Law first came out of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.* The Church of *Rome* pretends also to be the only Church of Christ, i.e. that there is no true Church of Christ but what is in union with and subjection to her. But this is as false a claim as the other. For there were diverse true Churches of Christ, before the Church of *Rome* was in being, which therefore could have no dependence upon her.

2. *That the Church of Rome is the Mistress of all other Churches* is another great Untruth. A proposition which if it should have been advanced in the first Ages of the Church, would have

startled all Christendom. Every metropolitical Church would presently have stood up, and loudly pleaded her own Immunities, Rights and Privileges independent upon *Rome*, or any other Metropolis. These Rights and Privileges were confirm'd as of primitive and ancient Custom by the 6th *Canon* of the great Council of *Nice*, as hath been before shewn; established also by the 8th *Canon* of the Oecumenical Council of *Ephesus*, as by and by will appear. Indeed in the days of old, when the Church of *Rome* was quite another thing from what now it is, all other Churches upon several accounts, paid a singular respect to her, and gave her the preeminence; but they never acknowledged her Mistresship over them, or themselves to be her Serving-Maids. This Language would then have sounded very harsh, and been esteem'd insolent and arrogant by all the Churches of Christ. In later days indeed she hath made her self Mistress, but a Mistress of misrule, disturbing the Peace, invading the Rights, and imposing upon the Faith of other Churches.

3. *That the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ*, i. e. under Christ the Head and Governour of the Universal Church is

is another gross untruth. The Universal Pastorship and Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*, over all other Bishops was never heard of, never pretended to by any Bishop of that Church for the first six hundred Years and more, as I have before shewn. To which all that I shall now add concerns our *British Church*. We say then, our Church of *Britain* was never under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*, for the first six hundred Years; *Britain* being a distinct Diocese of the Empire, and consequently having a Primate of her own, independent upon any other Primate or Metropolitan. This appears first from the Customs of our Church during that time, in the observation of *Easter*, and the administration of Baptism, different from, as was before observ'd, the *Roman Custom*, but agreeing with the *Asiatick Churches*. For it is altogether incredible, that the whole *British Church* should so unanimously have dissented from *Rome* for so many hundred Years together, if she had been subject to the Jurisdiction of the *Roman Bishop*, or that the *Roman Bishop* all that time should suffer it, if he had had a Patriarchal Power over her.

2. The same is evident by the unanimous Testimony of our Historians, who tell us that when *Austin* the Monk came into *Britain*, as St. *Gregory's* Legate (which was after the 6th Century was fully compleat and ended) and required submission from our Church to the Bishop of *Rome*, as her Patriarch, the proposal was rejected, as of a new and strange thing never heard of before. The Answer of *Dinothus*, the learned Abbot of *Bangor*, in the name of all the *Britons* is famous, *viz.* "That they knew no obedience due to him, whom they call'd the Pope, but the obedience of Love, and that under God they were govern'd by the Bishop of *Caerleon*. Under God, *i. e.* immediately, without any Foreign Prelate or Patriarch intervening, they were to be govern'd by the Bishop of *Caerleon*, as their only Primate and Patriarch. Which privilege continued to the succeeding Bishops of that See for several Ages, saving that the Archiepiscopal Chair was afterwards removed from *Caerleon* to *St. Davids*. And that this was indeed the sense not only of *Dinothus*, but of all the whole Body of our *British* Clergy at that time, all our Historians tell us, witnessing the absolute

absolute and unanimous resolution of the *British* Clergy, both Bishops and Priests, synodically met together, not to subject themselves to the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*. *Vide Spel. Com. Gual. Mon. lib. 2. cap. 12. Bedam omnesque alios.*

This being the antient privilege of the *British* Church, we have an undoubted right of exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*, by the antient Canons of the Catholick Church: Particularly by the sixth Canon of the great *Nicene* Council above-mentioned, by which it was decreed, *That the antient Customs should every where obtain, and that the then privileges of every Province should be preserved inviolate.* But this is most evident from the eighth Canon of the Council of *Ephesus*, occasioned by the famous case of the *Cyprian* Bishops, which was this: The Metropolitan of *Cyprus* being dead, (*Troilus* the Bishop of *Constance*,) the Bishop of *Antioch* pretended that it belonged to him to ordain their Metropolitan, because *Cyprus* was within the Civil Jurisdiction of the Diocese of *Antioch*. Upon this, the *Cyprian* Bishops made their Complaint to the General Council

at *Ephesus*, grounding it upon the *Nicene* Canon, and pleading that their Metropolitan had been of antient time exempt from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Antioch*, and was ordain'd by a Synod of *Cyprian* Bishops : Which privilege was not only confirm'd to them by the *Ephesine* Council, but a General Decree passed, *That the Rights of every Province should be preserved whole and inviolate; which it had of old, according to the antient custom.* And it is to be observed, that the Bishop of *Antioch* had a more colourable pretence to a Jurisdiction over the *Cyprian* Bishops, than *Gregory* could have to a Jurisdiction over our *British* Churches : For *Cyprus* was indeed within the Civil Jurisdiction of *Antioch*, but our *Britain* was originally it self a distinct Diocese of the Empire. Yet the *Ephesine* Fathers judged, that antient custom should prevail in the case of the *Cyprian* Bishops; how much more then should it in ours ? Certainly Pope *Gregory*, when by his Legate *Austin*, he challeng'd to himself a Jurisdiction over our *British Church*, was ignorant of, or had forgotten, or else regarded not the Canons of the *Nicene* and *Ephesine* Councils. If it be objected, that our *British*

British Church afterwards submitted her self to the Bishop of *Rome* as her Patriarch, which Power he enjoyed for many Ages, and that therefore our first Reformers cannot be excused from Schism, in casting off that Power which by so long a prescription he was possess'd of; we answer, we did indeed yield our selves to the *Roman* Usurpation, but it was because we could not help it, we were at first forced, awed, and affrighted into this Submission. For, who hath not heard of the barbarous Massacre of the poor innocent Monks of *Bangor*, to the number of Twelve hundred, for refusing *Austin's* Proposal, and asserting the ancient Rights and Privileges of the *Britannick* Churches? When this Force ceas'd, and we were left to our liberty and freedom of resuming our Primitive Rights, why might we not do it, as we saw occasion, without the imputation of Schism? This is not only our just Plea, but it is ingenuously confess'd by Father *Barns* our learned Country-Man, and of the *Roman* Communion.

His words are these: "The Island of " *Britain* anciently enjoyed the same " privilege with that of *Cyprus*, that

“ is to say, of being in subje<sup>c</sup>tion to  
“ the Laws of no Patriarch: Which  
“ Privilege, though heretofore abolish-  
“ ed by Tumults and force of War,  
“ yet being recovered by consent of the  
“ whole Kingdom, in *Henry the Eighth's*  
“ Reign, seems for Peace-sake most  
“ proper to be retained, so it be done  
“ without breach of Catholick Unity,  
“ or incurring the charge of Schism.  
Indeed, we had very great reason to  
resume our Primitive Right, and Pri-  
vilege of Exemption from the Jurisdicti-  
on of the Bishop of *Rome*, when by  
means thereof, he Lorded it over our  
Faith, and imposed manifest and grofs  
Corruptions both in Doctrine and Wor-  
ship upon our Consciences. But this  
by the way. We return to the Article  
of the *Trent* Creed now before us.

Concerning which, it is farther to be  
observed, that it founds the universal  
Pastorship of the Bishop of *Rome* up-  
on a *Divine Right*. It says, the *Bishop*  
of *Rome* is the *Vicar of Jesus Christ*;  
i. e. under Christ the Head and Gover-  
nour of the universal Church. *Quo jure?*  
He is *St. Peter's Successor*. What then?  
Why *St. Peter* was constituted by Christ  
the Prince of the Apostles, i. e. (if there  
be

be any connexion of Parts in the Article) he had by Christ committed to him Authority and Jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles, and consequently over the whole Church.

But the falsehood and folly of this pretence, hath been manifestly exposed by very many Writers of our Church: Particularly, that great Man Dr. *Bramhall*, *Davenant Determ. Q. 47.* Primate of *Ireland*, hath sufficiently refuted it in these few words.

“ Let us consider, saith he,

“ First, That all the Twelve Apostles were equal in Mission, equal in Commission, equal in Power, equal in Honour, equal in all things, except priority of Order, without which no Society can well subsist.

“ So much *Bellarmin de Pont.* confesseth, that by these words, *As my Father sent*.

“ *me, so send I you*, our Saviour endowed them with all the fulness of Power that mortal Men were capable of. And therefore no single Apostle had Jurisdiction over the rest, *Equals have no power over each other*; but the whole College of Apostles, to which the supreme Managery of Ecclesiastical

“ Affairs did belong in common : Whe-  
“ ther a new Apostle was to be ordain’d,  
“ or the Office of Deaconship was to be  
“ erected ; or fit Persons were to be de-  
“ legated for the ordering of the Church,

“ as Peter and John, Judas  
*Act. 1. c. 6.* “ and Silas ; or Informati-  
*c. 8. c. 15. c. 11.* “ ons of great moment  
“ were to be heard, as a-  
“ gainst Peter himself ? (tho’ Peter out  
“ of modesty might condescend, and sub-  
“ mit to that to which he was not ob-  
“ liged in Duty ; yet it had not become  
“ the other Apostles to sit as Judges upon  
“ their Superior, placed over them by  
“ Christ ; ) or whether the weightier  
“ Questions, of the calling of the Gen-  
“ tiles, and Circumcision, and the Law  
“ of Moses, were to be determin’d ?  
“ still we find the Supremacy in the Col-  
“ lege.

“ Secondly, That drowsie Dream, that  
“ the plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power  
“ and Jurisdiction was given by Christ  
“ to St. Peter, as to an ordinary Pastor,  
“ to be derived from him to his Suc-  
“ cessors, but to the rest of the Apostles,  
“ as Delegates for term of Life, to die  
“ with themselves, as it is lately and bold-  
“ ly asserted, without Reason, without  
“ Authority

“ Authority either Divine or Humane ; so  
“ it is most repugnant to the Doctrine of  
“ the Fathers, who make all Bishops to  
“ be the Vicars and Embassadors of Christ,  
“ (not of the Pope) and Successors of the  
“ Apostles, indifferently *Vicaria Ordina-*  
“ *tione*, who make but one Episcopacy  
“ in the World, whereof every Bishop  
“ hath his share. St. Peter was a Pastor,  
“ and the Pastoral Office is of perpetual  
“ necessity in the Church. True ; but  
“ so were all the rest of the Apostles Pa-  
“ stors as well as he. And if we ex-  
“ amine the matter more narrowly, *cui*  
“ *bono* ? For whose advantage this Di-  
“ stinction was devised ? It was not for  
“ St. Peter’s own advantage, who setting  
“ aside his Principality of Order, is con-  
“ fessed to have had but an equal share  
“ of Power with his Fellow Apostles, but  
“ for the Pope’s Advantage, and the Ro-  
“ man Court’s, whom they desire to in-  
“ vest, solely with the Key of all Original  
“ Jurisdiction.

“ And if we trace on this Argument a  
“ little farther, to search out how the  
“ Bishop of *Rome* comes to be St. Peter’s  
“ Heir, *ex aſſe*, to the exclusion of his  
“ elder Brother the Bishop of *Antioch*,  
“ they produce no Authority that I have  
“ seen,

“ seen, but a blind, ill grounded Legend,  
“ out of a counterfeit *Hegeſippus*, of St.  
“ Peter’s being about to leave *Rome*, and  
“ Christ’s meeting him upon the way,  
“ and admonishing him to return to *Rome*,  
“ where he must be crucified for his  
“ Name; which Reason halts on both  
“ fides; the Foundation is Apocryphal,  
“ and the Superstructure is weak and un-  
“ jointed, without any necessary con-  
“ nexion.

We have now, I think, sufficiently made good our second Charge against the Church of *Rome*, viz. *That she hath changed the Primitive Canon and Rule of Faith, by adding many new Articles to it; and those so far from being necessary Articles of Faith, that they are not Truths, but manifestly erroneous Propositions, repugnant to Reason, Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Catholick Church.* And yet all the Clergy of the Roman Communion are now forced not only to subscribe, but in the most solemn manner to swear to them. O miserably enslaved Clergy!

There was a time when the *Gallican* Church understood her own Liberty, and boldly asserted it, refusing to own the Authority of the *Trent* Convention, as being al-

altogether influenced and govern'd by the Court of Rome. 'Twas a brave Protestation of the Embassador of France, made in the face of the Council of Trent, in the Name of the King his Master, and the French Clergy, in these words: *We refuse to be subject to the Command and Disposition of Pius the Fourth; we reject, refuse, and contemn all the Judgments, Censures, and Decrees of the said Pius.* And although (most holy Fathers) your Religion, Life and Learning, was ever, and ever shall be of great esteem with us; yet seeing indeed you do nothing, but all things are done at Rome rather than at Trent, and the things that are here publish'd, are rather the Decrees of Pius the Fourth than of the Council of Trent; we denounce and protest here before you all, that whatsoever things are decreed and publish'd in this Assembly, by the meer Will and Pleasure of Pius, neither the most Christian King will ever approve, nor the French Clergy ever acknowledge to be the Decrees of a General Council.

I wish the Gallican Church had still persisted in this resolution: Yes, (saith a great Man of our Church so she did, and

## 86 The Church of Rome has corrupted

Bramhall  
Tom. I. p. 128.

and doth to this Day. [For  
tho' she doth not oppose the  
Council of Trent, but acqui-  
esce, to avoid such Disad-  
vantages as must ensue thereupon, yet she  
did never admit it.] I should be heartily  
glad if this were true; but if all the  
Clergy of France, which represent the  
French Church, do as well as the Clergy  
of the other Roman Catholick Domini-  
ons, subscribe and swear to the *Trent*-  
Creed, (as I suppose they do; and if  
they did not, I cannot see how they  
could be accounted within the Commu-  
nion of the Roman Church;) then they  
admit of the Council of *Trent* with a  
witness, in its full Extent and Latitude,  
as to all its Canons, Decrees, and Defi-  
nitions, not only which concern Points  
of Doctrine, (as is pretended,) but all  
other which relate to the Discipline and  
Government of the Church. For this is  
the last Article of the *Trent* Creed:  
"Moreover, what things soever else are  
"delivered, defined, and declared by the  
"Sacred Canons and Oecumenical Coun-  
"cils, and especially by the holy Coun-  
"cil of *Trent*, I undoubtedly receive and  
"profess.

Sect. IV. 3. The third and last thing  
we

we charge the Church of *Rome* with, is, *That she hath lamentably corrupted the Primitive Liturgy, and Form of Divine Worship.* This was a necessary consequent of the former ; so corrupt a Faith could not but produce as corrupt a Worship. To enumerate and represent in their proper Colours, all the Corruptions of the Worship of God in the Roman Church would fill a large Volume. I shall therefore only briefly point at some of them. The Prayers of that Church are in a Tongue generally not understood by the People, contrary to Reason, which of it self dictates, that when we pray to God we ought to understand our own Prayers ; contrary to the plain Declaration of Scripture, *1 Cor. 14.* contrary to the Practice of the Catholick Church in the first Ages, when Christians every where prayed to God in the Language of their respective Countries, as *Origen* expressly tells us in his Eighth Book against *Celsus*, p. 402. *Justin Martyr* also, who lived very near the Apostolick Age, informs us, That in the Christian Assemblies of his time, there were *Kou& E&uch&os*, Common Prayers, *i.e.* Prayers wherein all that were present, joined in common, and bore a part ; and that (as we learn from

88 *The Church of Rome has corrupted*

*Cyprian. Serm.  
de Oratione.*

from other very ancient Authors,) by making their *Responses* aloud in due place, and by saying the other Prayer after the Priest or Deacon, *Submissâ voce*. Now there are no such Common Prayers in the Church of *Rome*, the Priests say and do all ; the People being left to gaze about, or to whisper one to another, or to look upon their private Manuals of Devotion, according as their inclination leads them.

Again; whereas in the first and best Ages, the Churches of Christ directed all their Prayers, according to the Scripture, to God only through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ : The Liturgy of the present Church of *Rome*, is interspersed with Supplications and Prayers to Angels and Saints, the unwarrantableness whereof I have above sufficiently shewn. To what is there said, I shall only add these two Considerations.

1st. Supposing (not granting) the learned Men of the *Roman Church* could by their subtle Distinctions, so refine the Practice of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, as to make it innocent to themselves ; yet Experience tells us, that the common People, who understand not those

those Distinctions, are prone to transgress, and run into Sin, and a grievous Sin too, in their Practice of it, *viz.* to be taken off in a great degree from that trust and affiance, that entire dependence on Christ, that love and gratitude toward him which they ought to have, and indeed to be more fond of the Saints than of their Saviour. It is visible to all Men, with what zeal the filly deluded Souls run to the Shrines of the Saints, how even prodigal they are in their Offerings to them, when in the mean time their Devotion toward their Saviour is very cold, and their Oblations to him sparing and niggardly. This is so manifest, that it hath been confess'd by learned Men of the *Roman* Communion. It is acknowledged by *Biel*, in *Can. Miss. Lect. 30. in Expos. Cant. Mariae.* "Most " of us are more affected towards some " Saint, than towards our Lord himself. By our *Halensis*, *Par. 4. Quæst. 26. Memb. 3.* " Sometimes Sinners are more " inclinable to supplicate the Saints, " than the Judge. *Cassander* also confesseth, there are Men in the Church of *Rome*, (otherwise no ill Men,) who trust in their Patron-Saints more than in Christ their Redeemer. His words are these: " There

90 *The Church of Rome has corrupted*

“ There are some, and those no bad Men  
“ neither, who have made choice of cer-  
“ tain Saints for their Patrons and Guar-  
“ dians, and put more trust in their  
“ Merits and Intercession, than in the  
“ Merits of Christ.

2dly. Whereas it is pretended by some *Romanists*, especially of late, that their Prayers to Saints amount to no more than an *Ora pro nobis*, a praying, or desiring them to pray for us, as we desire the Prayers of one another here on Earth; this is manifestly false. For besides what hath been before observed, that they pray to Saints Deceased, and in a state and place vastly distant from them, wherein they cannot possibly hear their Prayers, unless by Revelation, or in *Speculo Trinitatis*, which are groundless imaginations: I say besides this, divers of their greatest Doctors ingenuously confess, yea, and boldly profess, that they pray to the Saints, as they are appointed by God, to be *canales gratiae*, between

him and us; Conduit-pipes

*Part 4. Quæst.* or Instruments of convey-  
26. *Art 5.* ing his Grace to us. So

our *Halensis*: “ Seeing the

“ Divine Grace descends upon us by  
“ means of the Saints, it is but fit that

“ our

" our ascent to God be through their  
" Mediation. So their learned Arch-  
bishop of *Florence* : " It is the Law of  
" the Deity to raise the things below to  
" those that are above, by  
" those in the middle; *Part 3. tit. 3.*  
" but as to the gifts of  
" Grace, the Saints stand in the middle  
" betwixt God and such as are travel-  
" ling towards him. Hence the divine  
" Benefits descend upon us by the medi-  
" ation of Angels and holy Souls. They  
say also, that the Saints do procure for  
us, and convey to us God's Blessings by  
the merit of their intercession, and that  
this is the ground of their praying to  
them. So again *ubi supra* : " The  
" Saints are invoked by us by reason of  
" our want of merit, that where our de-  
" fects fail, those of others may help  
" us out. So the great  
Master of the Sentences, *Lib. 4. Dist.*  
Peter Lombard : " We 45.  
" pray them to intercede for us, that is,  
" that their merits may succour us.

And indeed most of their Prayers to  
the Saints are so expressed, that they  
cannot without violence be interpreted  
to any other sense.

But most extravagant is the invocati-  
" on

92 *The Church of Rome has corrupted*

on and worship of the Blessed Virgin,

used and practised in the

*Cassand. Conf.*

*Art. 21. de*

*Cult. sanct.*

Church of *Rome*. I will

not urge here the Hymn

in *Cassander's* time sung in

their Churches : " Befeech thy Mother,

" command thy Son, O happy Parent,

" Who makest expiation for our Wick-

" edness, By thy Authority as a Mother

" command the Redeemer. Nor the

Psalter of our Lady, mentioned also by

*Cassander*, as that which was in use in

his time, in which through the whole

Book of Psalms, wheresoever the Name

of the Lord occur'd, it was changed into

the name of our Lady. Tho' I know

not whether those horrid Blasphemies

were ever censured and condemned by

any publick act of the *Roman Church*.

But I do affirm, that there are still

such addresses and forms of Prayer to

the blessed Virgin, either enjoyn'd, or

allow'd by Authority to be used in the

Church of *Rome*, as no Man, who hath

a due concern for the honour of his Re-

deemer, can read or hear without ab-

horrence and detestation. Such is that,

In the Office of Blessed *Mary*, where

they thus speak to her : " Hail Queen,

" the Mother of Mercy, our Life, De-

" light

“ light, and Hope, hail ; we shelter our  
“ selves under thy protection, despise  
“ not our supplications in the times of  
“ our necessity ; but deliver us from all  
“ dangers, thou ever glorious Virgin.  
This is surely more than a *Pray for us.*  
For they pray unto her as their Life and  
Hope, and fly to her as their Refuge  
and Protection, beseeching her to deliver  
them always from all dangers : But  
chiefly it is to be remark'd that she is here  
called the *Queen and Mother of Mercy.*

Would you know the  
meaning of this ? *Bertho-*  
*rius* will tell you : “ The Lib. 19. Mo-  
ralitatum cap.  
4.  
“ truth is, whereas the  
“ Kingdom of God consists in these two  
“ Virtues, Justice and Mercy, God be-  
“ stow'd on *Mary*, the Queen of Para-  
“ dise, the half part of his Kingdom,  
“ that is, the Mercy. And for this  
“ cause it is, she is called the Mother  
“ of Mercy. The same In Canon.  
Miss & Lett. 8.  
exposition you may find in *Biel.* And *Cassandra* al-  
so acknowledgeth this to be the sense  
of that title given to the Blessed Virgin.

In the Litany of our Lady published in  
English here among us, she is called  
“ Queen of Angels, Patriarchs, Prophets  
“ and

94 *The Church of Rome has corrupted*

“ and Apostles, source of the Fountain  
“ of Grace, Refuge of Sinners, Comfort  
“ of the Afflicted, and Advocate of all  
“ Christians. Now we have no instance  
of such Attributes given to the Blessed  
Virgin, either in the holy Scriptures, or  
in the Writings of the ancient Fathers;  
and indeed they are too big for any mere  
Creature. For here the Government of  
Heaven, and all the holy Angels therein,  
is attributed to her, which belongs only

to our Lord Christ. And

*Ephes. 1. 20.* what do they mean by that  
*21. 22.* title which they give her  
of *Source* (Scaturigo) of

*the Fountain of Grace?* I cannot imagine  
any other meaning of it, than this, that  
the Virgin *Mary* receiving first the eman-  
nation or efflux of Grace, from God the  
Fountain of Grace, by and through her,  
all Grace is carried and conveyed down  
to all the Faithful. And so indeed *Ber-  
nardinus* explains the matter in these

words: “ No Creature has

*Serm. 61. Art.* “ obtained any Grace or Vir-  
*1. c. 28.* “ tue from God, but by the  
“ dispensation of this pious

“ Mother. They that under this No-  
tion address themselves to the Blessed  
Virgin, surely do much more than desire

her

her to pray for them, as we desire the Prayers of one another.

What do they mean when they say she is the Refuge of Sinners? From what hath been said before, concerning the Kingdom of Mercy, supposed to be committed to the Blessed Virgin, and concerning the Title of Queen of Mercy given her, we may conclude the sense to be this, that when Sinners are troubled in their Consciences, and terrified with the sense of their Sins, and of the Judgments of God denounced against them, they may and ought to have recourse to her, as the Queen of Mercy, as their *Asylum* and *Sanctuary* to shelter and protect them from the divine Vengeance. This a credible Author assures us, hath been represented in several Roman Catholick Temples, in which Christ hath been painted with an angry menacing Countenance, casting his Darts against Sinners, and the Blessed Virgin interposing her self as Mediatrix and repelling his Darts. But Christ our Lord directs poor guilty Sinners, whose Consciences are oppressed with the burthen of their Sins, to a far better Refuge, yea the only Refuge they are to fly to, even to himself. *Come unto me, all ye*  
*that*

96 *The Church of Rome has corrupted  
that labour and are heavy laden, and I  
will give you rest, Matth. 11. 28.*

And who can read without the greatest Horrour, such a Prayer to the Blessed Virgin as this that follows: *O my Lady, holy Mary, I recommend my self into thy blessed trust, and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy Mercy, this Night and evermore, and in the hour of my death, as also my Soul and my Body: And I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and miseries, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession, and by thy merits, all my works may be directed according to thine and thy Son's will. Amen.* What fuller expressions can we use to declare our absolute affiance, trust and dependence on the eternal Son of God himself, than they here use in this recommendation to the Virgin? And who observes not that the will of the Blessed Virgin is expressly joyn'd with the will of her Son, as the rule of our Actions, and that so, as, that her will is set in the first place? A smatch of their old blasphemous impiety, in advancing the Mother above the Son, and giving her a commanding power over him. Yet this recommendation to the Blessed Virgin, is to be seen

seen in a Manuel of Prayers and Litanies printed at *Antwerp*, no longer ago than 1671. and that *permisso Superiorum*, appointed to be used in the Evening Prayer for Fryday. The Book I had from a near Relation of mine (who had been seduced to the Church of *Rome*, but afterwards returned again to the Communion of the Church of *England*) who assured me, that she her self used it, by the direction of her Confessor in her private Devotions.

There was a Book publish'd (and that too *permisso Superiorum*) and in great vogue among our English Catholicks in the Reign of King *James the Second*, entituled, *Contemplations of the Life and Glory of the holy Mary*. Wherein you may find these words, *God hath by a solemn Covenant pronounced Mary to be the treasury of Wisdom, Grace and Sanctity under Jesus*. *So that whatsoever gifts are bestow'd upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the mediation of Mary*; *No one being gracious to Jesus, who is not devoted to Mary, nor hath any one been specially confident of the Patronage of Mary, who hath not through her received a special blessing from Jesus*. *Whence it is one great mark of the Predestination of*

89 The Church of Rome has corrupted

the Elect, to be singularly devoted to  
Mary, since she hath a full power as a  
Mother, to obtain of Jesus, whatever he  
can ask of God the Father, and is com-  
prehended within the Sphere of Man's  
Predestination to Glory, Redemption from  
Sin, and Regeneration by Grace. Nei-  
ther hath any one petitioned Mary, who  
was refused by Jesus, nor trusted in  
Mary and was abandoned by Jesus. Af-  
terwards he tells us, p. 9. That tho' the  
condition of some great Sinners may be  
so deplorable, that all the limited Excel-  
lency, Merits, and Power, of all the  
Saints and Angels, cannot effectually bend  
the Mercies of Jesus to relieve them,  
yet such is the acceptableness of the  
Mother of Jesus, to Jesus, that whoso-  
ever is under the verge of her protection,  
may confide in her intercessions to Jesus.  
There needs no Comment to set forth  
the horridness of these assertions. Upon  
the whole matter, I cannot but think  
those silly Women of Arabia, who once  
a Year offer'd a Cake in honour to the  
Blessed Virgin as Queen of Heaven, to  
be as excusable at least as her Devotees  
in the Church of Rome. And yet they  
*Heres. 79.* in their Days were thought  
worthy of a place in the Ca-  
talogue

atalogue of Hereticks. Sure I am most of the Arguments *Epiphanius* useth against the *Colliridians*, may serve every whit as well against the Papists.

To pass by the Worship of Images, allow'd and practised in the Church of *Rome*, of which I have said enough before.

Come we now to the principal part of the Christian Worship, the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. How lamentably hath the Church of *Rome* vitiated the Primitive Institution of that most Sacred Rite ! She hath taken from the Laity, the Blessed Cup, contrary to our Blessed Saviour's express Command as expounded by the practice of the Apostles, and of the universal Church of Christ, for the first ten Centuries, as hath been above observ'd.

All the learned Advocates of the *Roman* Church, with all their Sophistry, have not been able to defend her in this matter, from manifest Sacrilege, and a violation of the very Essentials of the Sacrament, as to the Laity administer'd, nor can they prove it so administer'd, to be a perfect Sacrament. He that would see this in a short compass fully proved, and all the weak Evasions of the *Roman*

100 *The Church of Rome has corrupted*

Determ. *nists obviated, may consult*  
Quæst. 58. *our learned Bishop Dav-*  
*enant. Besides, the whole*  
*administration of it is so*  
*clogg'd, so metaphoriz'd and defaced*  
*by the addition of a multitude of Cere-*  
*monies, and those some of them more*  
*becoming the Stage, than the Table of*  
*our Lord, that if the blessed Apostles*  
*were alive, and present at the celebrati-*  
*on of the Mass in the *Roman* Church,*  
*they would be amaz'd, and wonder what*  
*the meaning of it was; sure I am, they*  
*would never own it to be that same Or-*  
*dinance which they left to the Churches.*

But the worst Ceremony of all is the elevation of the Host, to be ador'd by the People, as very Christ himself under the appearance of Bread, whole Christ, Θεόνθεωπός, God and Man, while they neglect the old *sursum corda*, the lifting up of their Hearts to Heaven, where whole Christ indeed is. A practice this is, which nothing can excuse from the grossest Idolatry, but their gross stupidity, or rather infatuation, in thinking that a piece of Bread, can by any means whatsoever, or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. A very sad excuse indeed.

More-

Moreover by what Reason, by what Scripture, by what example or practice of the Primitive Churches, can the *Romanists* defend their carrying about the Holy Sacrament in procession, or the mockery of their solitary Masses? I might pass from the holy Eucharist, to the other Sacrament of Baptism, and expose the many strange Ceremonies used in the *Roman* Church in the Consecration of the Font, and in the very Administration of that Sacrament. I might also take notice of the Prayers used by the order of the *Roman* Church in the consecration or blessing of certain inanimate things, for the producing supernatural effects, such as curing Diseases, driving away Devils, &c. without any warrant from Scripture, or promise of God, that such effects shall follow. But I shall stop here.

I have now gone through the several Heads of Discourse, which I proposed to my self, and sufficiently I think proved that the Church of *Rome*, hath altered the Primitive Ecclesiastical Government; changed the primitive Canon or Rule of Faith, and lastly, miserably corrupted the primitive Liturgy, and Form of Divine Worship. For these reasons

laid together, I can never be induced to enter into the Communion of the Roman Church as now it is : And for the same reason ( to speak my Mind freely,) I wonder how so learned a Man as *Monsieur de Meaux* can with a good and quiet Conscience continue in it.

*Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your Souls.*  
Jer. 6. v. 16.

---

**F I N I S.**

6 DE 66

---

---

# APPENDIX.

---

*The Differences in the chief Points of Religion, between the Roman Catholicks, and us of the Church of England ; together with the Agreements which we for our parts profess, and are ready to embrace, if they for theirs were as ready to accord with us in the same. Written to the late Countess of Peterborough, by Dr. John Cosins, afterwards Lord Bishop of Durham.*

## The DIFFERENCES.

WE that profess the Catholick Faith and Religion in the Church of England, do not agree with the Roman Catholicks in any thing whereunto they now endeavour to convert us. But we totally dissent from them (as they do from the Antient Catholick Church) in these points.

## A P P E N D I X.

1. That the Church of *Rome* is the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches in the World.
2. That the Pope of *Rome* is the Vicar General of Christ : Or that he hath an Universal Jurisdiction over all Christians that shall be saved.
3. That either the Synod of *Trent* was a General Council ; or that all the Canons thereof are to be received as matters of Catholick Faith, under pain of Damnation.
4. That Christ hath instituted seven true and proper Sacraments in the New Testament neither more nor less, all conferring Grace, and all necessary to Salvation.
5. That the Priests offer up our Saviour in the Mass, as a real, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and that whosoever believes it not, is eternally damn'd.
6. That in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole substance of Bread is converted into the substance of Christ's Body, and the whole substance of Wine into his Blood, so truly and properly, as that after Consecration, there is neither any Bread nor Wine remaining there, which they call Transubstantiation,

## APPENDIX.

on, and impose upon all Persons under pain of Damnation to be believed.

7. That the Communion under one kind, is sufficient and lawful (notwithstanding the Institution of Christ under both) and that whosoever believes or holds otherwise is damned.

8. That there is a Purgatory after this Life, wherein the Souls of the dead are punished, and from whence they are fetch'd out by the Prayers and Offerings of the Living : And that there is no Salvation possibly to be had by any that will not believe as much.

9. That all the old Saints departed, and all those dead Men and Women, whom the Pope hath of late canoniz'd for Saints, or shall hereafter do so, whosoever they be, are and ought to be invocated by the Religious Prayers and Devotions of all Persons, and that they who do not believe this as an Article of their Catholick Faith cannot be saved.

10. That the Reliques of all these true or reputed Saints, ought to be religiously worshipped ; and that whosoever holdeth the contrary is damned.

11. That the Images of Christ and the blessed Virgin, and of the other Saints, ought not only to be had and retained,

## APPENDIX.

but likewise to be honoured and worshipped, according to the use and practices of the *Roman Church*, and that this is to be believed as of necessity to Salvation.

12. That the power and use of Indulgences, as they are now practised in the Church of *Rome*, both for the Living and the Dead, is to be received and held of all under pain of eternal Perdition.

13. That all the Ceremonies used by the *Roman Church* in the Administration of the Sacrament (such as are Spittle and Salt in Baptism, the five Crosses upon the Altars, and Sacrament of the Eucharist, the holding of that Sacrament over the Priest's head to be adored, the exposing of it in their Churches to be worshipped by the People, the circumgestation and carrying of it abroad in Procession upon their *Corpus Christi* day, and to their Sick for the same, the Oyl and Chrism in Confirmation, the anointing of the Ears, the Eyes and Noses, the Hands and Reins of those that are ready to dye; the giving of an empty Chalice and Paten, to them that are to be ordained Priests, and many others of this nature, now in use with them) are of necessity to Salvation, to be

## APPENDIX.

be approved and admittted by all other Churches.

14. That all the Ecclesiastical Observations and Constitutions of the same Church (such as are their Laws of forbidding all Priests to Marry ; the appointing several orders of Monks, Friars, and Nuns in the Church ; the Service of God in an unknown Tongue, the saying of a number of *Ave Maria's* by tale upon their Chaplets ; the sprinkling of themselves and the dead Bodies with Holy Water, as operative and effectual to the Remission of venial Sins, the distinctions of Meats to be held for true Fasting, the religious Consecration and incensing of Images, the baptizing of Bells, the dedicating of divers Holidays for the immaculate Conception, and the bodily Assumption of the blessed Virgin ; and for *Corpus Christi*, or Transubstantiation of the Sacrament ; the making of the Apocryphal Books to be as Canonical as any of the rest of the holy and undoubted Scriptures, the keeping of those Scriptures from the free use and reading of the People, the approving of their own Latin Translation only, and divers other matters of the like nature) are to be approved, held

## APPENDIX.

and believed as needful to Salvation; and that whoever approves them not, is out of the Catholick Church, and must be damned.

All which, in their several respects, we hold some to be pernicious, some unnecessary, many false, and many fond, and none of them to be imposed upon any Church or any Christian, as the Roman Catholicks do upon all Christians, and all Churches whatsoever, for matters needful to be approved for eternal Salvation.

---

## Our AGREEMENTS.

**I**F the Roman Catholicks would make the Essence of their Church (as we do ours) to consist in these following points, we are at accord with them: In the reception and believing of:

1. All the Two and Twenty Canonical Books of the Old Testament, and the Twenty Seven of the New, as the only Foundation and perfect Rule of our Faith.

2. All

## APPENDIX.

2. All the Apostolical and Antient Creeds, especially those which are commonly called the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Creed of St. *Athanasius*, all which are clearly deduced out of the Scriptures.
3. All the Decrees of Faith and Doctrine set forth as well in the first four General Councils, as in all other Councils, which those first four approved and confirmed, and in the 5th and 6th General Councils besides (than which we find no more to be General) and in all the following Councils that be thereunto agreeable; and in all the Anathema's or Condemnations given out by those Councils against Hereticks, for the defence of the Catholick Faith.
4. The unanimous and general consent of the Antient Catholick Fathers, and the Universal Church of Christ, in the Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, and the Collection of all necessary matters of Faith, from them during the first Six Hundred Years, and downwaads to our own days.
5. In acknowledgment of the Bishop of *Rome*, if he would rule and be ruled by the antient Canons of the Church, to be the Patriarch of the *West*, by right of

## APPENDIX.

of Ecclesiastical and Imperial Constitution, in such places where the Kings and Governors of those places had received him, and found it behooful for them to make use of his Jurisdiction, without any necessary dependence upon him by divine Right.

6. In the reception and use of the two blessed Sacraments by our Saviour; in the confirmation of those Persons that are to be strengthened in their Christian Faith, by Prayer and Imposition of Hands, according to the examples of the holy Apostles, and antient Bishops of the Catholick Church; in the Publick and Solemn Benediction of Persons, that are to be joyned together in holy Matrimony; in publick or private Absolution of penitent Sinners; in the Consecrating of Bishops, and the Ordaining of Priests and Deacons for the Service of God in his Church by a *lawful* Succession; and in visiting the Sick, by praying for them, and administering the blessed Sacrament to them, together with a final Absolution of them from their repented Sins.

7. In Commemorating at the Eucharist, the sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, once truly offered for us.

8. In

## APPENDIX.

8. In acknowledging his sacramental, spiritual, true and real Presence there to the Souls of all them, that come faithfully and devoutly to receive him according to his own Institution in that Holy Sacrament.

9. In giving thanks to God for them, that are departed out of this Life in the true Faith of Christ's Catholick Church, and in praying to God that they may have a joyful Resurrection, and a perfect Consummation of Bliss, both in their Bodies and Souls, in his Eternal Kingdom of Glory.

10. In the Historical and Moderate Use of Painted and true Stories, either for Memory or Ornament, where there is no danger to have them abused or worshipped with Religious Honour.

11. In the use of Indulgences, or abating the Rigour of the Canons, imposed upon Offenders according to their Repentance, and their want of ability to undergo them.

12. In the Administration of the Two Sacraments, and other Rites of the Church, with Ceremonies of Decency and Order, according to the Precept of the Apostle, and the free Practice of the Antient Christians.

13. In

## APPENDIX.

13. In observing such Holy Days and Times of Fasting, as were in use in the first Ages of the Church, or afterwards received upon just Grounds, by Publick and Lawful Authority.

14. Finally, in the reception of all Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Canons made for the ordering of our Church, or others; which are not repugnant either to the Word of God, or the Power of Kings, or the Laws established by *right* Authority in any Nation.

---

*The*

## APPENDIX.

### *The Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

*After having recited the Nicene Creed,  
the following Articles are thus con-  
tinued, viz.*

13. **I** Most firmly receive and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all the other Observances and Constitutions of the same Church.

14. I do receive the Holy Scriptures in the same sense that Holy Mother Church doth, and always hath, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them ; neither will I receive and interpret them otherways than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

15. I do also profess, that there are seven Sacraments of the new Law, truly and properly so called, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, though not all of them to every one, *viz.* Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Marriage, and

## APPENDIX.

and that they do confer Grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, may not be repeated without Sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the received and approved Rites of the Catholick Church, in the solemn Administration of the aforesaid Sacraments.

16. I do embrace and receive all and every thing that hath been defined and declared by the holy Council of *Trent*, concerning Original Sin and Justification.

17. I do also profess, that in the Mass there is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really and substantially, the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a change made of the whole substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of Wine into the Blood; which change the Catholick Church calls Transubstantiation.

18. I confess also, that under one Kind only, whole and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament, is taken and received.

19. I do firmly hold, that there is a  
Purgatory,

## APPENDIX.

Purgatory, and that the Souls there detained, are relieved by the Suffrages of the Faithful.

20. I do likewise believe, that the Saints reigning together with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that they do offer Prayers unto God for us, and that their Relicks are to be had in veneration.

21. I do most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, and of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due Honour and Veneration ought to be given to them.

22. I do affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian People.

23. I do acknowledge, the holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church, to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*, the Successor of *St. Peter*, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

24. I do also without the least doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined and declared

## APPENDIX.

red by the sacred Canons and cœcumeni-  
cal Councils, and especially by the holy  
Synod of *Trent* ; and all things contra-  
ry thereunto, and all Heresies whatso-  
ever condemned, rejected and anathem-  
atized by the Church, I do likewise  
condemn, reject and anathematize. This  
true Catholick Faith, without which no  
Man can be saved, which at this time I  
freely profess, and truly embrace, I will  
be careful (by the help of God) that the  
same be retained, and firmly professed  
whole and inviolate as long as I live ;  
and that as much as in me lies, that it  
be held, taught and preach'd by those  
under my power, and by such as I shall  
have charge over in my Profession. I  
the said *N.* promise, vow and  
swear : So help me God, and these his  
Holy Gospels.

6 DE 86

FINIS.

---

---

## The C O N T E N T S.

	Page
<b>T</b> HE Bishop of Meaux's Letter to Mr. Nelson.	3
Bishop Bull's Answer.	6
The Catholick Church, what meant by it.	7
The Primitive Ecclesiastical Govern- ment, quite altered by the Church of Rome.	16
The Church of Rome has chang'd the Primitive Canon, or Rule of Faith.	22
The Holy Eucharist only a Commemo- rative Sacrifice.	24
Transubstantiation contrary to Reason, Scripture and Antiquity.	27
Doubted of by some in the Roman Communion.	32
The Communion in one kind.	35
Concerning Purgatory.	37
Prayers for the Dead.	38
Invocation	

## The Contents.

	Page
Invocation of Saints.	39
The Worship of Reliques.	47
The Worship of Images.	49
Concerning Papal Indulgences.	65
The Roman Church not Mother of all Churches.	71
Not Mistress of all Churches.	73
The Pope not universal Pastor.	74
The British Church not under his Ju- risdiction.	75
The Church of Rome has lamentably corrupted the Primitive Liturgy, and form of Divine Worship.	87

---

## A P P E N D I X.

*The Differences in the chief Points  
of Religion, betwixt the Church of  
Rome and the Church of England,  
by Bishop Cosins.*

*The Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

### E R R A T A.

Page 25. Title, for chang'd by the  
Church of Rome, read a commemo-  
rative Sacrifice.

---

---

## BOOKS Printed for Richard Sare.

**T**HE Principles of the Christian Religion explained, in a brief Commentary on the Church Catechism 8vo. price 2 s.

A Discourse against Prophane Swearing.

The Church of *Rome* no Guide in matters of Faith, 8vo. price 6 d. All three by the Right Reverend Dr. *Wake*, Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*.

*Parsons's Christian Directory*, 8vo. price 5 s.

*Thomas à Kempis*, 8vo. and also in 12mo. price 5 s. and 2 s.

Sixteen Sermons Preach'd at *Boyle's Lecture*, in the Years 1701. and 1702. in 4<sup>to</sup>.

A Paraphrase and Commentary on all the Epistles and Gospels, appointed to be read on all Sundays and Holy-days throughout the whole Year.

*Epicetus's Morals*, with *Simplicius's Commentary*, 8vo. price 5 s. These by the Reverend Dr. *Stanhope*, Dean of *Canterbury*.

Essays upon several Moral Subjects, 8vo. price 5 s.

A short view of the Prophanes and Immortality of the *English Stage*, 8vo. price 3 s. 6 d.

*Marcus Antoninus's Meditations*, &c. 8vo. price 5 s. These three by the Reverend Mr. *Collier*.

An Answer to all the Excuses and Pretences usually made, for Mens not receiving the Holy Sacrament, price 3 d. or 20 s. 100.

Plain

# BOOKS Printed for Richard Sare.

Plain Instructions for the Young and Ignorant, price 3 d. or 20 s. 100.

An Essay toward making the Knowledge of Religion easie, 12mo. price 2 d. or 12 s. 100.

Short and plain Directions for spending one day well, price 1 d. or 6 s. 100.

The Christian Scholar, in Rules and Directions for Children and Youth. price 3 d. or 20 s. 100.

The Nature and Design of Holy-Days explain'd: Or, short Instructions for the Observation of the Feasts and Fasts appointed to be kept by the Church of *England*, price 6 d. or 4 s. 100.

The great Sin and Folly of Drunkenness, with a particular Address to the Female Sex. price 6 d. or 40 s. 100.

The Wisdom of *Solomon* explain'd, in several Discourses upon some of his Selected Proverbs, by way of Dialogue: Adorn'd with variety of Observations, Moral, Political and Historical, price 6 d.